

5
59
NEW SERIES

Vol. XLVI, No. 7

University of Detroit
THE CLERGY REVIEW
JULY, 1961
Library

ARTICLES

	PAGE
(1) A Tale of Two Rituals By the Very Rev. Canon J. B. O'Connell	385
(2) Our Lord Jesus Christ I. Our Lord By the Rev. L. Johnston	392
(3) The Biblical Movement and the Decrees of the Biblical Commission By the Rev. Bruce Malina, O.F.M.	399
(4) English Spiritual Writers xxv. Spiritual Reading for Our Times By Lancelot C. Sheppard	406

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

The Gelasian Sacramentary By the Rev. Henry Ashworth, O.S.B.	414
---	-----

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(1) Transplantation of Kidneys <i>inter vivos</i>	419
(2) Saying a Public Mass after Inadvertently Breaking Fast By the Rev. L. L. McReavy	424
(3) Suppressed Feasts and Titulars	426
(4) Missa Pro Populo By the Very Rev. Canon J. B. O'Connell	427

CORRESPONDENCE

Parish Pools and Collections	429
The Easter Vigil	430
Feast of Our Lady Mediatrix of All Graces	433

BOOK REVIEWS

Scripture and Patristics	435
Literature	444
Short Notices	447

Price Four Shillings Net

This widely experienced firm of

**CATHOLIC
FINANCIAL CONSULTANTS**

invites enquiries from Parish Priests and Diocesan Financial Secretaries in all matters connected with fund-raising by direct giving.

Hundreds of parishes (including complete dioceses) throughout the British Commonwealth are valued long-term clients, attesting to our ability and integrity.

Cathos Limited

**450a HIGH ROAD
WEMBLEY, MIDDLESEX
Telephone: Wembley 5258**



T

NE

T

Rom

auth

14 J

for

Rom

by

Jan

Bish

tha

Ritu

195

alw

(S.I.

as t

tion

Wh

ity

also

dear

sac

re

tak

this

of t

pat

of

ver

in

so

in

mo

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLVI No. 7 JULY 1961

A TALE OF TWO RITUALS

TWO new rituals have recently made their appearance. One for England and Wales, entitled *Excerpta E Rituali Romano pro Dioecesibus Angliae et Cambriae Edita*, which was authorized by a Rescript of the S. Congregation of Rites dated 14 January 1959 and published on 12 May 1961. The second for Ireland entitled *Collectio Rituum ad instar Appendix Ritualis Romani pro Omnibus Dioecesibus Hiberniae*, which was sanctioned by a Rescript of S.R.C. of 12 December 1959, published in January 1961 and came into effect by order of the Irish Bishops on 1 February 1961. Both rituals indicate by their title that they are derived from, and supplementary to, the Roman Ritual. This book, of which the newest typical edition is that of 1952, is the ritual for all churches of the Roman rite, and may always be used in all places even where local rituals exist (S.R.C. 3792^o).

From the pastoral point of view the Ritual may be regarded as the most important of the liturgical books and the preparation of a new ritual for any country an urgent pastoral task. While the Missal concerns the people primarily as a community at worship—*plebs sancta Dei*—the Ritual, although it has also a collective aspect, primarily concerns them as individuals, dealing as it does with the administration to them of the sacraments and sacramentals from birth to burial.

Nowadays the Church is solicitous that the people should take an active, conscious, intelligent part in the Liturgy, and this they cannot do unless some provision is made for the use of their mother-tongue, since the first medium in such participation in any rite is language. While there is a sharp diversity of view about the use of the vernacular in the Mass, there are very few persons so ultra-conservative as not to admit its value in the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals. And so the Holy See—which alone is competent to make decisions in this matter—has for many years been granting more and more use of national languages in local rituals, and nearly all

the countries of Europe, as well as the United States of America and many dioceses in Africa and Asia, have now in use bilingual or trilingual rituals. Accordingly, it was high time that England with Wales and Ireland came into line with the modern liturgical movement and prepared rituals with such amount of the mother-tongue as their hierarchies consider desirable and the Holy See is willing to concede. In any case, a new edition of the local ritual, with necessary supplementary rites not provided for in the Roman Ritual, was necessary in both countries to bring it into conformity with the new typical editions of the Roman Ritual of 1925 and 1952. No edition of the official ritual in England, *Ordo Administrandi Sacra*menta, had been published since 1915, and in Ireland, where there has hitherto been no official local ritual, the latest unofficial book seems to have been the *Rituale* edited by Mgr Lane and published in 1945.

The remote preparation for a bilingual ritual for England and Wales was made when the hierarchy of these countries commissioned the Bishop of Plymouth (Dr Grimshaw, now Archbishop of Birmingham) to prepare an English translation of the *Ordo Administrandi*. This was published in 1956, under the title *The Small Ritual*, for private use only, and gave no authority to the clergy to use any more English in its rites than had previously been allowed (in the interrogations at baptism and in part of the marriage rite). A copy of this book was presented by the Archbishop of Birmingham and the Bishop of Menevia to Cardinal Cicognani, the Prefect of S.R.C. in September 1956, and later that year the then Archbishop of Liverpool (now Cardinal Godfrey) wrote to Rome asking that this translation might have the formal approval of the S. Congregation. In September 1957 leave was given by S.R.C. to prepare a ritual for England and Wales for submission to the Congregation, and some general directions were given about its form. Accordingly, a draft was prepared, identical in content with *The Small Ritual*, but with some additional blessings likely to be needed for general use. This draft ritual was presented to S.R.C. in July 1958, and a petition to the Pope made by Cardinal Godfrey on behalf of the hierarchy that "he would have regard to present-day needs and circumstances and

would deign . . . to allow the use of the mother-tongue, of English, in certain prayers used in the administration in some of the sacraments, namely, Baptism, Extreme Unction and Matrimony, and also in the Burial of the Dead". In reply to this petition S.R.C. issued a Rescript dated 14 January 1959 permitting the preparation of a new ritual for England and Wales in which the entire Latin text would appear, and the English text beside it for those parts in which its use is permitted. S.R.C. then gave the parts of the rite of Baptism, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony in which English may be used, adding a direction about its use after the rite of burial had been carried out in Latin. This part of the Rescript is the same as the Congregation is accustomed to issue in reply to a petition for the use of the vernacular—it may be called the "stock rescript"—but for England and Wales (not for other countries, so far) it added this clause: "the use of the mother-tongue is not in any way to be extended to the recital of other prayers, blessings, etc., beyond those which have been strictly determined above". The Rescript was received by Cardinal Godfrey in March 1959, and inquiry was then made in Rome about the added restrictive clause. The reply was that "the Rescript was to be interpreted in the restrictive sense and the final Ritual prepared accordingly". The *Excerpta* prepared in accordance with the directions of S.R.C. was published on 12 May and warmly commended to the clergy by Cardinal Godfrey. Like the Roman Ritual itself it is not imposed, nor is the amount of English that will be used by any priest imposed—he may use less, he may not use more, than is allowed by the Holy See—but if he does use the vernacular in those parts where it is allowed he must use the version given in *Excerpta*, as the Archbishop of Birmingham directs in his Preface to the ritual.

In Ireland in 1957 the hierarchy set up a commission of three liturgical experts—Drs Montague and McGarry of Maynooth and Canon McCarthy of Clonliffe College—with the Bishop of Ardagh as chairman, and also a special committee of "translators with wide experience and representing the various dialects" for the preparation of the Irish version, to prepare a trilingual draft ritual for submission to the Irish bishops and after it had received their approval to

be sent to Rome for the approval of the Holy See. This draft when ready contained not only the English and Irish versions of certain parts of the Roman Ritual, but also some new forms not found in that book, inspired mainly by the rituals that had been approved by the Holy See for Germany in 1950 and Lugano (Switzerland) in 1955. In the petition submitted to Rome by Cardinal D'Alton on behalf of the Irish hierarchy he asked the Holy Father "for the fostering of the piety of the faithful" to grant the use of English and Irish in certain prayers, not only for three of the sacraments and for the exequial rites, but also for the care of the sick and dying, and he submitted the draft ritual (*Collectio*) for approval. S.R.C. examined this with great care, amended it in certain details and approved the draft so revised and amended. It added that "in so far as it may be necessary for the people's understanding and piety" the vernacular may be used according to the following rules, and then the stock rescript (with some verbal changes only) was given. The important point about the Irish ritual is that the entire book, in the form in which it was returned from S.R.C., has been approved,¹ and this means that certain new rites have been accepted and a more generous measure of the vernacular allowed than the stock rescript concedes. The new *Collectio* came into force in all the dioceses of Ireland on 1 February 1961, subject to any special instruction about its use that any individual bishop may give for his diocese.

The S. Congregation of Rites has some general rules about the format of bilingual rituals: (a) the Latin text must be printed in full, and by the side of each Latin text of which a translation may be used the vernacular version is to be printed, no more of the mother-tongue may be given either in oratio obliqua or in italics or as a footnote²; (b) the rubrics may be given in Latin only. The stock rescript permitting the preparation of a bilingual Ritual: (i) does not permit the translation of the forms of the sacraments—presumably to prevent even the slightest change in these important texts—nor of blessings;

¹ This was also done in 1950 in the case of the German ritual.

² In its first edition the U.S.A. *Collectio* gave at the foot of the page and in different type the English version of texts that may be used in Latin only.

(ii) excludes the translation of exorcisms, possibly because some theologians now hold that they are expressive of a theology that needs to be brought up to date in view of the developments of doctrine regarding original sin and its effects; (iii) requires, normally, that the psalms be given in Latin only, this may be due to the fact that a definitive Latin text of the Psalter is now being prepared.

The amount of the mother-tongue allowed by the stock rescript of S.R.C. is very limited indeed: parts of the rite of Baptism, Extreme Unction and Matrimony and the Nuptial Blessing outside Mass. And so there is no vernacular in the rites of Holy Communion outside Mass, of Communion of the Sick, of the Last Blessing, of the prayers for the sick and dying given in the Roman Ritual, of Confirmation administered in case of necessity. None of the mother-tongue may be used in the exequial rites for adults¹ or children; none in any of the numerous blessings of the Roman Ritual (including the very important and common rite of the churcning of women). The English ritual has been drawn up in strict conformity with the terms of this stock rescript which alone was granted to this country.

Ireland has fared much better. The mother-tongue is allowed in addition for: most of the rite of Communion of the sick, for part of the Last Blessing, for all three new forms of the care of the sick (including the psalms, but excluding the blessing at the close of each form) and for all the prayers for the dying; in the exequial rites the first part carried out at the house of the dead person may be in the vernacular both for adults and children; while churcning, including the psalms, may be in the vernacular, except the formula of blessing at its close.

While the English ritual contains nothing that is not found in the Roman Ritual, except the reconciliation of a convert, the Irish book amplifies and improves some of the rites and has some admirable new rites: (i) there is a short form for the reconciliation of a dying convert;² (ii) a *ritus continuus* for the

¹ Prayers in the vernacular, appointed by the Ordinary, may be added after the Latin rite.

² This was first drawn up for the pocket ritual *Excerpta e Rituale Parvo* published in Ireland in 1920.

administration of three sacraments and the Last Blessing to the dying is given, with the opening prayers, aspersion, and (later) the recitation of *Confiteor* only once;¹ (iii) there is a choice of three schemes, for use according to circumstances, of prayers and readings for the sick; (iv) there are some additional prayers for funerals, including a very beautiful prayer said at the graveside for the mourners; (v) the marriage service—which is a mere skeleton in the Roman Ritual²—has been entirely remodelled and enriched, ambiguities removed (e.g. the reply “I will”), obsolete and unintelligible forms (“if holy Church will it permit”, “thereto I plight thee my troth”) dropped, expressions clarified (“this gold and silver I thee give, tokens of all my worldly goods”) and some striking prayers added; (vi) there is a form of matrimony for a mixed marriage;³ (vii) a much improved form of churhing is provided and an entirely new form for the case in which the baby has died.⁴ With the exception of churhing, in the Irish ritual all blessings have to be in Latin, as in the English book. One regrettable omission in the Irish ritual is the blessing for a sick adult (R.R., IX, iv, 7), the concluding prayer of which seems to have been derived from the lorica, *Faeth Fiada*, attributed to St Patrick. The form for imparting the Papal Blessing by a priest who has received the privilege of doing so (R.R., IX, x, 1) would also be useful in the *Collectio*. In both rituals it would be well to add a rubric about imparting the Last Blessing to several persons simultaneously (R.R., VI, vi, 8). In the English ritual the Latin text of the Psalms is the Pian text of 1945, the older version⁵ is given in an appendix; the English translation is that of Monsignor Knox, with an older translation in the appendix. In the Irish ritual citations from the Bible are in the Douai version, but for the Psalms—of which the Latin text is the Pian—the American Confraternity translation is used.

¹ This rite, which was in use until the thirteenth century (and still is in certain rituals, e.g. in the Dominican rite), was revived in the German ritual of 1950 and the American one of 1954. The Irish ritual does not, however, follow the older and, it would seem, the better order of the anointing before Viaticum, an order favoured by modern theologians.

² R.R. (VII, ii, 6) supposes it to be augmented by laudable local usages.

³ In Ireland none of the usual rites are allowed in this case.

⁴ This is to be found in the German and American rituals also.

⁵ May this now be used seeing that the Pian version has replaced the older ones in the Roman Ritual?

The use of the mother-tongue in the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals is intended to enable the recipient to take an active, intelligent share in the ceremony, and to create the atmosphere for their more fitting and fruitful reception. It has also a didactic and apologetic value. How valuable would be an understanding of the rites of baptism, of the last sacraments, of churcning, of the burial service, for those present at these ceremonies! And so it is to be hoped that in the future there may be greater concessions of the use of the vernacular such as have been granted to many places in Asia and Africa, especially for all rites that concern the dying, for the reconciliation of a convert (when an understanding of the rite is of special moment) and for the more important and commoner blessings.

The format of both rituals is of a very high order, the English one beautifully printed by the Cambridge University Press on toned paper and published by Burns and Oates; the Irish one printed in 12mo. Ehrhardt and published by M. H. Gill (Dublin).

For the easier use of both books it would help if: (a) the leading words in some rubrics were printed in a different colour or in a different fount, so that they could be read at a glance in the course of a ceremony; (b) the heading on each right-hand page indicated the part of the rite printed thereon (as is done in the French bilingual ritual); (c) the change of sex and number in the English version of certain prayers was indicated.¹

The translation of texts from the liturgical books is a much more difficult and laborious task than the inexperienced imagine. It requires not only a mastery of the Latin and English languages, but also a specialist's knowledge of liturgical Latin and of the historical background of each text if its real meaning is to be detected. And so the clergy of England and Wales will be of one mind with His Eminence Cardinal Godfrey in declaring that "we are all greatly indebted to His Grace the Archbishop of Birmingham for his care and diligence in preparing . . . *Extracts from the Roman Ritual*". Even if much

¹ This for the English ritual. The change is indicated in the Latin text (as in R.R.) ; and in the vernacular version also in the Irish ritual.

of his excellent vernacular version in *The Small Ritual* of many parts of the Roman Ritual may not yet be used as the official language of several rites, it will be of great value in helping to impart to the laity a knowledge and appreciation of some of the treasures of the Roman rite. The clergy of Ireland, too, owe a very special debt of gratitude to the little company of liturgical experts whose devoted labour have given them so excellent a ritual. Appreciation in no mean measure is also called for of the care and skill of publishers and printers which produced books of such a high typographical standard.

The most important question about any bilingual ritual is the quality of the translation that it contains. An adequate appreciation of the literary character of the vernacular of *Excerpta* and *Collectio* could not be given in an article which is already over-long. Perhaps the Reverend Editor of THE CLERGY REVIEW may, at some future date, accept an article on this topic.

J. B. O'CONNELL

OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST

I. OUR LORD

Names mean something. The title by which you choose to call someone says something about the way you look at that person. At least, this should be so. It would be so when the title was first used. But words tend to be worn out with usage, their outlines blurred by much handling. This is true of the most normal title we use for Jesus—"Our Lord". It has come to be no more than a respectful paraphrase for Jesus (which, strangely enough, still does have an *aura* of reverence about it); it has come to be almost a proper name itself. When we use it, we think rather of the person it denotes than of the particular aspect of the person that the title stresses. In order to restore its full meaning, it would be useful to see what the title meant to the people who first used it—to hear the inflexion they put into it, the implications, the overtones.

The most obvious and basic implication of the word "lord" is

the idea of possession. The "lord of the house" is the householder; the "lord of the vineyard" is the owner of it. In a society where slavery was normal, it was also used of a similar relationship to persons—the lord is the man who has complete and unquestioned control over his servant: the correlative of lord in this sense is slave. It was also used of kings—their power was in any case as total and despotic as that of a lord's over his slaves. And the relationship between the subject and the king was as actual and personal as that of a slave to his master: "our lord" meant the king who was actually the speaker's sovereign; he would speak to the subject of a neighbouring state of "your lord". But in the Roman empire there was one king who was king of kings, supreme ruler over all the lesser states and kingdoms within empire: He was *the lord*—the lord Caesar.

Of course, even when "lord" has such a definite and specific meaning—owner, king, emperor—it was still possible for it to be weakened, and to be used in a purely conventional sense as a title of courtesy and respect. It is in this sense that we must expect the word to be used in the majority of cases in the Gospels where Jesus is addressed as "Lord". At the most it will have the slightly deeper sense of respect attributed to a teacher, a Rabbi. So, for example, at the Last Supper when our Lord prophesies His betrayal, His followers ask: "Is it I, Lord?" And when Judas in particular asks the same question, it is expressed in the form: "Is it I, Rabbi?" (Matt. xxvi, 22, 25). Similarly, at the Transfiguration Peter calls out: "Lord, it is good for us to be here" (Matt. xvii, 4); but in Mark's version of the same incident, the word put on Peter's lips is "Rabbi" (Mark ix, 5).

But Israel did have a king, to whom the title of lord in its royal sense was proper. This was the descendant of David, the Messiah. This king was to be God's instrument in establishing the divine rule over the whole world—the kingdom of God. And the first article of the Christian faith was that Jesus was this lord: "Let all the house of Israel know most surely that God has made this Jesus Christ and Lord" (Acts ii, 36). This faith grew immediately out of the empty tomb of the Resurrection. This was God's unmistakable sign of approval for all that Jesus had claimed for Himself. This was the reversal of the judgement which condemned Him to die—He had been condemned as an

impostor, making unsupported claims to be Messiah; now God shows that these claims are true. This was the victory over all the evil that the world had so long groaned under, the evil summed up in the fact of death. The one who conquered this enemy must indeed be a king, he must be "lord".

The Resurrection, with all its implications of victory, triumph, glory, was the source of the Christian faith. And in every use of the term "lord" after this incident the idea of the Resurrection is never totally absent. It is "the Lord" as the disciples saw Him on the lakeside after the Resurrection, where none dare ask him who he was; for they knew he was the Lord (John xxi, 12). It is the Lord surrounded by blinding majesty as Saul saw Him on the road to Damascus: "I am Jesus," says the figure; but Saul replies: "Lord, what would you have me do?" (Acts ix, 5).

But though the Risen Lord is undoubtedly the king, the kingdom does not yet appear. This is a matter of some concern to the disciples: "Lord, is it now that you are to restore the kingdom to Israel?", they ask (Acts i, 6). And all through those early years, a feeling of expectancy pervades the Christian community. Their Lord had appeared; surely soon He must come to take possession of His kingdom, to show His glory openly, to exercise His authority, to take His seat on the throne and pass judgement on all mankind. The technical name for the solemn entry of a king into his kingdom was "parousia", or "coming". ("Epiphany" was also used in the same sense, though this was more properly used of divine manifestations.) In the Roman empire such visits of the emperor were splendid occasions, with trumpets heralding the royal coming, and the whole population going out to meet him and accompanying him back to the city with cries of joy and praise. And it is just such a scene that St Paul puts before the Thessalonians in his account of the "coming" of the Lord (I Thess. iv, 13-18).

This too, then, will be a body of ideas which will be conjured up by the mere mention of the word 'Lord'. The Epistle to the Thessalonians is full of such undertones: "What is our hope and joy and crown of glory (a reference to the garlands worn on such joyful occasions)? Is it not you, who will be our pride and glory in the coming of our Lord?" (I Thess. ii, 19).

And the idea of judgement in particular, so closely allied with the exercise of royal power, follows frequently on the mention of the title "Lord". "Do not judge until the Lord comes; then everyone will receive praise from God" (I Cor. iv, 5). "This man was raised up by God . . . and appointed judge of the living and the dead" (Acts x, 40-42). And even where it is not a question of the final judgement directly, the title "Lord" springs naturally to Paul's lips when he is speaking of any act of judging—when he is excommunicating a member of the Corinthian church, for example, he does it "through the power of our Lord Jesus" (I Cor. v, 5).

We noted above that we must expect most uses of the title "Lord" in the Gospels to be simply a title of respect. To the extent to which the evangelists are giving the actual historical sense of the scene, this will still be true. But the awareness of the writers and the readers of all that their Lord was must often have given added meaning to the title, even in such circumstances. In the account of the raising of Lazarus, for example (John xi), the word Lord appears a disproportionate number of times: surely this is because John sees in this incident a symbol (a "sign", according to his own special terminology) of the Resurrection of Jesus Himself, by which He was raised to kingly power and solemnly invested with the royal title, "Lord". Similarly, the parables must often have taken on an even deeper meaning: the king who went to a far country leaving his servants in charge of his possessions, the king who made a feast for his son, the king who cancelled his subject's debt—these were now not merely stories with a moral; they were indeed the account of their own king, Jesus their Lord.

But "the Lord was long in coming". For a moment, the early Church seems to have hesitated about the meaning of this delay in the glorious manifestation of the king and the kingdom. But soon they realized that no matter what one was to think of the "parousia", it was an undoubted fact that here and now Jesus Himself was Lord of glory; even now He is enthroned at the right hand of God and rules and judges in power and majesty. So Stephen sees Him: sees the heavens opened and "the Lord Jesus" standing on the right side of the Father, ready to receive His servant into the joy of His Lord, and to pass sentence

on those who murdered him. In the Eucharist in particular, it was their risen Lord in glory whom they received; it was the "Lord's supper", the "body of the Lord"—you could not use "Jesus" in such a context. And since it was their royal Lord that they received, they were thus temporally introduced into the presence of that majesty which the early Christians called the "parousia": it was an anticipation of that coming in glory, and a guarantee of their part in it; they received the body of the Lord "until he comes" (I Cor. xi, 26); and their prayer was the fervent desire that the king and the kingdom would be revealed—"Maran atha", "Come, Lord" (I Cor. xvi, 22).

Even now Jesus is Lord. There is something touching in the absolute and unhesitating faith of the early Church that their founder is a king; that He is the king of Israel; that He is even, this ruler of the tiny Palestinian community, greater than the ruler of the Roman empire, the lord Caesar. But there is even more than that: "He is Lord of all", is St Peter's simple and uncompromising statement (Acts x, 36): king of Jew and gentile, king of Roman and barbarian; but king also of all creation, and of everything that exists in heaven, on earth and under the earth (Phil. ii, 11); crowned with glory and honour above the angels (Heb. ii, 9); "All that is in heaven or on earth, visible and invisible, thrones, dominations, principalities and powers—he is above them all" (Col. i, 16). It is even in this way that the first Christians arrived at something of a solution to the problem of our Lord's divinity. The Jewish faith was immovably monotheist. After so many hundreds of years of instruction and reminder, often in the form of lapse and relentless punishment, this at least was now firmly fixed in their minds—that there is one God. When Jesus then appears with his disconcerting statements about His own character and nature, it is not surprising that it was a stumbling block to the Jews. It was a difficulty, or rather a mystery, for the first Christians also; and they had no philosophic definition of "person" and "nature" to help them to explain it. What they did know was that God was Lord—supreme ruler of heaven and earth. But now they saw Jesus invested with the totality of that "Lordship"—as if God had, so to speak, abdicated his Lordship and transferred it to Jesus. But of course God cannot actually abdicate. Therefore, if Jesus

is Lord, it must mean that He somehow shares the divine prerogative. He is God's equal, He sits at the right hand of God. "God has raised him up and given him the name which is above every name"—the name of Lord, the quality and power of God Himself—"so that in this name which Jesus now possesses, every knee shall bow" (Phil. ii, 9-10).

Jesus is indeed the Lord; that is to say, the glorious, almighty ruler of heaven and earth is indeed the friend and teacher they had known in Galilee. He was no phantasm; he ate before them, and they could touch his hands and feet. But there was a difference after the Resurrection. What this difference was it was difficult to express. Visibly, it was expressed for them by the fact that he could pass through the locked doors; technically, we speak of it as being a "glorified body"; the way St Paul speaks of it is "being in the Spirit". He is still a man, but after the Resurrection all the limitations of human existence are removed, and the power of the Spirit of God, the Spirit of life, has full play in Him. "He is constituted son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness, through the resurrection from the dead" (Rom i, 4). "A spiritual body"—it sounds like a contradiction, but that is the best St Paul can do: "A body sown corruptible, rising incorruptible: sown in weakness, rising in power; sown an animal body, rising a spiritual body" (I Cor. xv, 42-44).

It is difficult to express; not surprisingly, since it is something unique in human experience. But though it may be difficult, one thing is clear—that the Risen Lord is the life-principle of the Christian also. Baptism is our union with Christ who died and rose again; and henceforth, the power of that risen, spiritual body is ours also. "He who is joined to the Lord is one spirit with him" (I Cor. vi, 17). If he is "son of God in power, according to the spirit of holiness" (Rom. i, 4), then that holiness is ours also: "You are in Christ Jesus, who has become for us our wisdom from God, and our justice and our holiness" (I Cor. i, 30). "The first Adam became a living soul; but the new Adam has become a life-giving spirit" (I Cor. xv, 45). "With unveiled eyes, we behold the glory of the Lord, and we are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the spirit of the Lord" (II Cor. iii, 18).

And, we note, this is still "the Lord" we are speaking of; still the king invested with supreme power and majesty. It is this person with whom we are united. This casts light on such a text as John iii, 3: our Lord, speaking to Nicodemus about the kingdom, that basic element in Jewish hope, tells him that no one can see the kingdom unless he is born again. The kingdom will not come into existence through force of arms or even through political manoeuvering; it will come into being through the rebirth of men in water and spirit—through baptism, by which we are united with the risen Lord, the king. In our own thinking we are sometimes inclined to make a distinction between the social character of our religion and its intimate, personal, spiritual character. But our Lord tells us that the two are identical. In the kingdom of God, there are no subjects; there are only joint-heirs with Christ, the king.

What we call our spiritual life, then, is nothing else than the life of the risen, glorified Lord which we have "put on". And not only is it the life we live now, but it is the guarantee that we shall one day be "a spiritual body" like Him. "Jesus Christ will transform our lowly bodies and make them like his own glorious body, by the same power by which he is able to subject everything to himself" (Phil. iii, 21). "God has raised up the Lord, and will raise us up also through his power" (I Cor. vi, 14). These things are all connected: the resurrection of the Lord—His fullness of the Spirit—His spiritual body—our spiritual life—and our own resurrection and bodily glory. "If the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwells in you, then he who raised up Jesus will raise up your mortal bodies also, through his Spirit who dwells in you" (Rom viii, 11).

We are not surprised, then, to find the Christian faith in the Acts of the Apostles, the earliest activity of the apostles, summed up in the title, "Lord": they bear witness to the Lord, they preach the Lord, they obey the Lord, they believe in the Lord, the number of those who believed in the Lord increases. . . . And this is not just a vague synonym. It implies very specifically the Risen Lord, Lord of all, enthroned in glory at the right hand of the Father, sharing God's power, and source of the divine life in us. Indeed this title is an adequate definition of the Christian faith. "Jesus is Lord"—to say that is to say

g of;
It is
such
at the
at no
gdom
even
being
rough
king.
ake a
nd its
lls us
re no

an the
. And
at we
st will
orious
every-
Lord,
i, 14).
Lord—
ual life
pirit of
hen he
s also,

in the
ostles,
e Lord,
in the
creases.
es very
lory at
source
inition
to say

everything: "If you confess the Lord Jesus, and believe that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom. x, 9).

And we too, for whom "our Lord" is the most frequent title we use for our Saviour, can make it the same all-embracing, total expression of our faith.

L. JOHNSTON

THE BIBLICAL MOVEMENT AND THE DECREES OF THE BIBLICAL COMMISSION

IN the course of conversation at clerical gatherings I have attended, not a few priests have entered into discussion about the new Biblical movement as it affects them, and the fact, as they see it, of the harm and heterodoxy it leaves in its wake. As seminarians almost all of them had read the decrees of the Biblical Commission. Now to their surprise, many of the books they read and the things they hear certainly do not agree with the positions they adopted in class or, for that matter, with the decisions of the Biblical Commission upon which those positions were based. The last of these decisions is dated 1943, and apart from the letter to Cardinal Suhard (1948) on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the literary form of Genesis 1-3, no official document has been promulgated to alter, modify or retract the earlier decisions of the Commission in an explicit way. Therefore the decrees are still in force. Or are they? If they are not binding, what, then, is their significance?

In this brief article I should like to discuss the significance of the decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission in the light of later Pontifical documents and other authoritative clarifications. What attitude must the Catholic, priest or layman, take toward the decrees of the Biblical Commission?

In his Motu Proprio, *Praestantia Sacras Scripturae*, Pope Pius X made it clear that the Catholic scholar is "bound in conscience to submit to the decisions" of the Biblical Commission, so that he cannot "escape the stigma both of disobedience and temerity nor be free from grave guilt" if he "impugns these

decisions either in word or in writing". To quote these statements in their solemn context:

Wherefore We find it necessary to declare and prescribe as We do now declare and expressly prescribe, that all are bound in conscience to submit to the decisions of the Biblical Commission, which have been given in the past and which shall be given in the future, in the same way as to the Decrees which appertain to doctrine, issued by the Sacred Congregations and approved by the Sovereign Pontiff; nor can they escape the stigma of both disobedience and temerity nor be free from grave guilt as often as they impugn these decisions either in word or writing; and this, over and above the scandal which they give and the sins of which they may be the cause before God by making other statements on these matters which are very frequently both rash and false.¹

This evaluation of the decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, published 18 November 1907, would seem to stifle any original research in the face of the Higher Criticism of the era, and indeed that seemed to have been the effect.² However, instead of launching into a tirade against the churchmen of this period for their neglect in scientific Biblical scholarship, let us try to understand the basis for their tutioristic approach.

Today we can hardly picture to ourselves the position of Catholic scholars at the turn of the century, or the dangers that threatened Catholic teaching on Scripture and its inspiration on the part of liberal and rationalistic criticism, which like a torrent tried to sweep away the sacred barriers of tradition. At present the battle is considerably less fierce; not a few controversies have been peacefully settled and many problems emerge in an entirely new light, so that it is easy enough for us to smile at the narrowness and constraint which prevailed fifty years ago.³

¹ *Rome and the Study of Scripture*⁴ (Grail: St Meinrad, Ind., 1958), p. 41.

² Cf. L. Vaganay, "Exegesis of the New Testament from the Renaissance to the Present Time", in A. Robert and A. Tricot, *Guide to the Bible*,² I, trans. by E. Arbez and M. McGuire, Desclée (New York, 1960), pp. 730-1.

³ Cf. the following footnotes. Translation and original texts in E. Siegman, "The Decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 18 (1956), p. 24. Obviously, I am greatly indebted to Fr Siegman's work, almost to the point of plagiarism.

These are the words of the Secretary of the Biblical Commission, the Very Rev. Athanasius Miller, O.S.B., and the Under-Secretary of the same Commission, the Rev. Arduinus Kleinhans, O.F.M. The passage is taken from their book reviews of the new *Enchiridion Biblicum*. The book reviews are more or less identical, although the Secretary wrote in German¹ and the Under-Secretary in Latin.² We shall consider some of their other judgements further on.

Now, however, to see how Catholic scholars legitimately attained liberty for research apart from (or rather within a broad interpretation of) the decrees of the Biblical Commission, we must consider the monumental encyclical of Pope Pius XII, *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, issued 30 September 1943. Indeed, some consider this encyclical a tacit revocation of the decisions of the Biblical Commission.³

Briefly, this encyclical was written to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Pope Leo XIII's *Providentissimus Deus*.⁴ In the first part of the encyclical, Pope Pius XII outlines the basic tenets of *Providentissimus Deus*. Then, after stating that "there is no one who cannot easily perceive that the conditions of Biblical studies and their subsidiary sciences have greatly changed within the last fifty years",⁵ the Pontiff treats of the following matters, given here in outline:

1. Recourse to the original texts: Importance of textual criticism, Meaning of the Tridentine Decree on authenticity of the Vulgate;
2. Interpretation of the Sacred Books: Importance of the literal sense, Right use of the spiritual sense (which must be intended by God), Study of the Fathers of the Church;
3. Special tasks of interpreters: Character of the sacred writers, Importance of the mode of writing, Studies of Biblical antiquities;
4. Ways of treating more difficult questions: Consoling Catholic exegetes;

¹ A.M., "Das neue biblische Handbuch", *Benediktinische Monatschrift* 31 (1955), pp. 49–50.

² A. Kleinhans, "De nova Enchiridii Biblici editione", *Antonianum* 30 (1955), pp. 63–5.

³ Cf. Siegman, art. cit., note 2, p. 23.

⁴ Cf. *Rome and Study of Scripture*, pp. 81–7.

⁵ Ibid., p. 87.

5. Use of Scripture in instruction of the faithful.¹

Probably the greatest single effect of this encyclical was the "liberty of action and thought"² that it offered the Catholic exegete. Moreover, after encouraging Biblical scholars not to be deterred in any way "from grappling again and again with these difficult problems, hitherto unsolved", Pope Pius XII adds the admonition which, as Fr Siegman puts it:³ "must have elicited a grateful prayer from more than one scholar":

"Let all the other sons of the Church bear in mind that the efforts of these resolute laborers in the vineyard of the Lord should be judged not only with equity and justice, but also with the greatest charity; all moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imagines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected."⁴

To return to our topic, what is the bearing of this encyclical relative to the decrees of the Biblical Commission? Although the Pope encourages textual criticism, form criticism, and literal exegesis, does he thereby revoke the decrees in question? Spacious room for doubt still remains.

However, the next document on the Scriptures in point of time seems to narrow down that room for doubt. The document in question is the reply to Cardinal Suhard, 19 January 1948, by the Very Rev. James M. Vosté, O.P., then Secretary of the Biblical Commission. As mentioned above, this document deals with the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the meaning of the first three chapters of Genesis (cf. Decree of Biblical Commission, 27 June 1907). The letter states:

If one would rightly understand and interpret in the light of this recommendation of the Sovereign Pontiff (the text cited immediately above) . . . the official answers previously given by the Biblical Commission . . . , one will readily grant that these answers are in no way opposed to further and truly scientific examination of these problems in accordance with the results

¹ Ibid., pp. 88-106.

² A. Bea, s.j., "Il problema del pentateuco e della storia primordiale", *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 99² (1948), p. 126.

³ Siegman, art. cit., p. 23.

⁴ *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, p. 101.

obtained during these last forty years. Consequently, the Biblical Commission believes that there is no need, at least for the moment, to promulgate any new decrees regarding these questions.¹

From this document, it seems that the decrees of the Biblical Commission must now (or can now) be interpreted in the light of *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. Yet are these sufficient indications that the decisions have been tacitly revoked?

Because these questions are certainly not merely academic, the clarifications given (but not officially promulgated) in 1955 by the Secretary and Under-Secretary of the Biblical Commission are most welcomed. After pointing out the additions and advantages of the new edition of the *Enchiridion Biblicum*, Frs Miller and Kleinhans continue:

Inasmuch as it is a collection of documents which show how Sacred Scripture has always been the primary source and foundation of the truths of Catholic faith and of their progress and development, the Enchiridion renders great service first of all to the history of dogmas. It reflects clearly, moreover, the fierce battle that the Church at all times has had to fight, though with varying degrees of intensity, to maintain the purity and truth of the Word of God. Especially in this respect the decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission have great significance. However, as long as these decrees propose views which are neither immediately nor mediately connected with truth of faith and morals, it goes without saying that the scholar may pursue his research provided always that he defers to the supreme teaching authority of the Church.²

Concerning the Scriptural encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XII, the authors write:

Encyclicals like *Providentissimus Deus* and *Divino Afflante Spiritu* show how she (the Church) exerts herself to promote in every way possible the solid and fruitful study of Scripture. These encyclicals present with admirable clarity the basic principles of Catholic interpretation which hold for all times

¹ Ibid., p. 149.

² Siegman, art. cit., p. 24.

and effectively close the door to subjective and arbitrary expositions. Thus they point out the way to an interpretation and use of Scripture calculated to nourish the life of souls and of the Church as well as to utilize fully the gains made by modern research.¹

Fr Siegman's comments on these passages are particularly enlightening:

The distinction which Frs Miller and Kleinhans make between decisions that are in some way connected with truths of faith and morals and those that treat questions of literary and textual criticism is perfectly natural. They affirm the freedom of the scholar with regard to the latter. As Dom Dupont observes, questions of authorship, date of composition, and integrity no longer have the crucial importance attached to them fifty years ago. Today it is clearly seen that these questions are independent of the inspiration and inerrancy of the text.² Fortunately emphasis has shifted to more positive preoccupations, particularly the fuller study of the text itself. Time that a few decades ago was spent in class on introductory problems (often with the result that the student acquired neither a greater love for the Scriptures nor understanding of them) can now be utilized in reading and explaining the text.

In some instances, at least, decisions of the Commission that affirm the historical character of certain parts of the Bible have a relation to truths of faith. This is evidently the case with the decisions that safeguard the historicity of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles and Genesis 1-3. The Catholic exegete will naturally now interpret these decisions in the light of the *Divino Afflante Spiritu* and subsequent papal pronouncements, particularly their insistence on the determination of the literary forms of the Bible in order to evaluate the sacred author's intention.³

Without delving into solutions of particular problems, I think we can safely conclude, then, that the decrees of the Biblical Commission will yield their truth-value *only when* interpreted in the light of the recent papal pronouncements.

¹ Ibid., pp. 24-5.

² J. Dupont, "A propos du nouvel Enchiridion Biblicum", *Revue Biblique*, 62 (1955), p. 418, in Siegman, art. cit., p. 26.

³ Loc. cit.

If in spite of such pronouncements the individual Catholic cannot decide which statements in the decrees factually pertain to faith and morals, his more proximate norm for deciding would be the majority consensus of Catholic exegetes. In this realm, the Catholic exegetes would be the *auctores probati* as their counterparts in the realms of dogma or morals. And like the latter, the Catholic Biblical scholar has full freedom in his realm of endeavour so long as he does not impinge upon the faith-and-morals decrees of the Biblical Commission, which continue to bind in conscience.

In conclusion, we turn again to Fr Siegman:

We should not be so naive as to look for a wholesale abandonment by Catholics of the positions enunciated in the Decisions of the Biblical Commission, as a result of the latest statements of the Secretary and Under-Secretary of the Commission. If conservatism in biblical scholarship means clinging doggedly to traditional positions, however convincing the contrary evidence, it can be only stagnation. If, however, conservatism means a reluctance to forsake these positions until the evidence is in, until the atmosphere is sufficiently cleared so that the scholar can see the cogency of the contrary position, then it represents a wholesome current that promotes progress in truth. This is the conservatism that the Church's Magisterium expects of us. Dom Dupont closes his analysis with an observation that all Catholic scholars will second: "Let us hope that by their serious and conscientious labor Catholic exegetes will justify the confidence which the Church's Magisterium has placed in them."¹

Christ the King Seminary,
West Chicago, Ill.

BRUCE MALINA, O.F.M.

¹ Ibid., p. 29.

ENGLISH SPIRITUAL WRITERS

XXV. SPIRITUAL READING FOR OUR TIMES¹

IN many ways it is a pity that no one has attempted to do for English spiritual writers what Bremond did for the French. In his eleven volumes he is studying, he tells us, "the inner life of French Catholicism . . . the sources, main currents, and development of a religious renaissance treated by many historians but to the best of my belief only chronicled very summarily".² It is noteworthy that he decided to begin with the period of the wars of religion, leaving untouched the previous centuries which saw the growth of the tradition to which his authors were the heirs. Such a method would hardly be suitable in a work about English spiritual writers for, as the present series of essays shows, there is a certain continuity to be discerned, tenuous though it is at times, through the whole series of writers down to our own days. Our mediaeval forbears, as Bremond said of his seventeenth-century mystics, "are much nearer to us than we think. Of that which we were formerly, 'something has remained in us, a fragment, a reminiscence, as it were' ".³

The writers studied in this series present us, then in miniature, with a picture of the inner life of English Catholicism. After the mediaeval authors, Dame Julian, Walter Hilton, Richard Rolle, the author of the *Cloud*, what stands out most clearly is the comparative absence of mystical writers (in the technical sense) of whom we find only two, Fr Augustine Baker and Abbot Chapman. There are very good reasons for this. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the period of the great mystical movement in France and Spain, was a time in this country of religious strife and persecution when there was hardly any spiritual writing, and mysticism found its living experience in martyrdom or else, as with Benet of Canfield, was

¹ This article concludes the series—Editor.

² Henri Bremond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis les guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours*, Volume I (Paris, 1916). English translation by K. L. Montgomery, *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, Volume I (London, 1928), pp. v-vi.

³ Bremond, op. cit., vol. I, p. vii.

practised in exile. Catholics in England down to the beginning of the nineteenth century were a small body fighting for their very existence with the result that what they produced was either polemical or mere necessary material for the minimum religious life that was possible at the time.

With emancipation, followed in less than a quarter of a century by the re-establishment of the hierarchy, a change occurred, though other circumstances intervened to make this new situation less fruitful than might have been expected: the difficulties inherent in the re-establishment of the hierarchy, the increase of the Catholic population due to the influx of Irish as a consequence of the famine, the lack of financial resources necessary to provide the churches and schools that were needed, all combined to hamper very considerably the intellectual and cultural development of Catholics in the nineteenth century. As a result, there is little that is original to be found until the end of the century. Newman is the one exception, of course, towering head and shoulders above the rest, but it is significant that he was the product not of a seminary in this country or of the English College in Rome, but of Oxford University. Faber, the writer who for his religious impact comes nearest to Newman, though in a very different class, had enjoyed similar advantages. As a result of Manning's mistaken policy to prevent English Catholics frequenting Oxford or Cambridge there was no provision for their higher education. If, in addition, it is recalled that the very large majority of them were poor it is hardly surprising that the nineteenth century has little of real importance to offer us save Newman.

Any appraisal of English religious writing must take account of the effects of the Reformation. Not only did it cut off Englishmen, the non-Catholics certainly and to a great extent the Catholics, from the continuing stream of religious thought on the Continent, but paradoxically it gave Catholics in this country a foreign *cachet* which they have been slow to lose. It could hardly have been otherwise. For something like two centuries their priests and leading laity were educated abroad, it was Government policy to represent the Catholic Church as a foreign institution, Catholics were struggling for existence. Small wonder that they endeavoured to remain a compact body

do for
French.
er life
, and
y his
very
th the
evious
ch his
suitable
present
be dis-
series
ars, as
much
merly,
nce, as

then
English
Walter
ends our
ters (in
gustine
ons for
I of the
time in
ere was
s living
eld, was

les gurus
by K. L.
(London,

apart from their fellow countrymen and appeared to shut themselves off from the main stream of national life and that even their speech and writings showed little mannerisms that could be termed unEnglish by their compatriots.¹

Despite the fact that many of the Oxford Movement converts did their best to make as clean a break as possible with all aspects of their former religious allegiance they infused into the Catholic body some of the cultural heritage from which it had largely been cut off by the stern realities of penal days. In some ways it can be said that they brought back to English Catholics, not so much the foreign devotions and lives of the saints that caused not a little trouble in the middle of the nineteenth century, as some of the tradition of English religious writing that had been developed outside the Church on the basis of pre-Reformation trends: Jeremy Taylor, Richard Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, to mention but three, contributed something to our heritage, having first absorbed something from it. Faber's "warmth", his liking for "hot" prayers can be ascribed to his former evangelical background even if he found what he wanted in Italian sources. If an English Bremond were to write a history of English religious thought these are matters that he would have to take into account. Nor could he neglect the Anglican borrowings from continental Catholic sources. Though this is too large a subject to be gone into here it may be worthwhile mentioning that in the seventeenth century Anglican editions of Francis de Sales, Louis of Grenada and Lanspergius appeared and that among Bishop Ken's books (still preserved in the Bath Abbey Library) are the works of St John of the Cross, Fénelon, Francis de Sales, etc. Dean Granville of Durham in the eighteenth century recommends the Jesuit Fr Bartolomeo Ricci's *Ars cogitandi* and *Ars meditandi* and has a good word to say of Fr Augustine Baker, though he adds a warning against his "enthusiasm".

¹ Archbishop Ullathorne writing to Abbot, later Cardinal, Gasquet (25 January 1888), says: "There is a phrase which you sometimes use, and which I take the liberty of pointing out, which the educated converts point out as limited to us old English Catholics, brought by us from France but not English, and refer to the phrase in *their regard*. . . . The English equivalent is *with respect to* or *with regard to*."—Shane Leslie, *Cardinal Gasquet* (London, 1953), p. 108. Then there is the difference in pronunciation by Catholics and non-Catholics of such words as *confessor*, *refectory*, etc., which continues to the present day.

A further line needing lengthy exploration is the relationship between the Catholic mystical tradition and Donne, Herbert, Traherne and Vaughan (the metaphysical poets), or Whichcote, Culverwell, John Smith, Cudworth and Moore (the Cambridge Platonists). All these are so many influences that go to make up the complex of our religious tradition, signs of a mutual interpenetration that went on and indeed goes on imperceptibly despite barriers of religious allegiance and belief.

It is difficult to sum up the characteristics of the English spiritual writing that are mentioned in this series. A practical approach to problems, in general a plainness of statement, avoidance, within reason, of rhetorical artifice, a certain solidity, an absence of fireworks—all these qualities have been attributed to English spiritual writers in the past by foreign critics. And yet as we examine the writings of the men and the woman mentioned in this series nearly every one of them appears as an exception in some respect or other to the rather dull catalogue of qualities quoted above.

Reading such remarks one cannot escape the impression that the commentator really means that dullness is the outstanding characteristic of English spiritual writing. And yet as we examine the writings of those mentioned in this series it seems impossible to label any as dull or indeed to lump them together as belonging to one category, to make of them an English "school" of spirituality, all neatly docketed and subdivided.

Indeed it is better to avoid such terms unless we can be sure of making clear their entirely relative nature. In a recent book Fr Louis Bouyer writes of the practice of systematically cultivating

a Benedictine spirituality, a Jesuit spirituality, a Carmelite spirituality etc.... There might be some justification for the practice if each Order or Congregation had confined itself to gathering together from its first Fathers those precepts and teaching applicable to its specific tasks. But it is hardly so when in each case an attempt is made to create a complete view of the spiritual world, systematically closed in upon itself and foreign, if not hostile, to other views formulated in a like manner.... Such attempts, whether overt or masked, contain an unavoidable

contradiction. How, for example, can Ignatian spirituality and Carmelite spirituality be set up against one another like two opposing groups when it is obvious that St. Teresa chose indiscriminately for directors Jesuits, Dominicans or Franciscans as well as Carmelites, providing that they were men of God and good theologians? And even St. Ignatius, despite the very definite structure of his spiritual edifice, neglected no source available to him in Catholic tradition, beginning with monastic sources whose ideal has sometimes been seen in radical opposition with his . . . St. Benedict, St. Francis, St. Ignatius never intended to do anything else than set before their contemporaries perennial Christian spirituality, Catholic spirituality, simply adapted in its presentation rather than in its fundamental principles to the immediate needs of their period.¹

It seemed necessary to emphasize this at the end of a series like the present one. Dame Julian, Walter Hilton, Fr Persons, Bishop Challoner, Mgr Knox, to take a random selection, are all trying to set before their contemporaries Christian, Catholic spirituality, adapted to the needs of their period; because they write in our language, because their method of approach is one that we find sympathetic, because their manner of thought has affinities with ours, they strike a chord within us, we are attracted to them and read them more easily perhaps than we do a Frenchman or a German, but it would be wrong nonetheless to endeavour to set up an English school of spirituality, an English way of holiness.

It is the more necessary to point this out at the present time as since the beginning of this century, and especially since the last war, certain movements have arisen, or seem even to have come to maturity abroad, and are now beginning to have an effect in this country. Thinking of our past naturally leads us to think of the future, and a conclusion to a series of this kind seems to call for some sort of analysis, or at least of some indication, of probable trends in the same field in our own times together with some appreciation of advantages and dangers.

Since the beginning of the century there has been taking place in the Church a theological movement, a theological

¹ Louis Bouyer, *Introduction à la vie spirituelle* (Paris, 1960), p. 23.

renaissance it might be called. It is characterized by a return to sources—to the Bible, regarded as containing God's message to mankind rather than as an anthology of snippets for quotation in support of a theological thesis, a polemical treasure chest; to the Fathers, also, as proclaiming and explaining the message; to the liturgy, in which the proclamation of the message takes place, as the worship of the *Church*, one result of the deeper perception of the theology of the Church. All these aspects of the renewal of theology, thus briefly summarized, are the result of an immense effort of work by theologians, Scripture scholars and liturgists. No one who examines attentively the theological work (in its broadest sense) being produced all over Europe at the present time can fail to observe the change that has taken place.

The results of all this are to be seen slowly emerging, even in this country, and it has exerted an influence on our religious writing, but not, perhaps, so great an influence as elsewhere. This is shown clearly enough in two matters that are really fundamental but which have not obtained here the prominence that they deserve. I refer to the liturgical movement and the Bible.

It would take too long to go into the history of the liturgical movement and the reasons for the misunderstanding of it that was current for so long in this country. Here we must confine ourselves merely to a recent manifestation, the reform of the liturgy.

A reform of the liturgy is in progress because in it the Church expresses her unchanging belief and in the course of time certain aspects of that belief were seen to be given less emphasis than was required, their expression in the liturgy was overshadowed by other, less essential matters. For example, the restoration of the Easter vigil, emphasizing the centrality of the resurrection in the Christian mystery, is a fundamental reform of obvious importance. Its relative failure in this country to make Easter night the high light of the whole of the Church's year, a pastoral occasion of immense importance, is indicative of our general lack of understanding of what the liturgical movement, now clearly encouraged by Rome, is all about.

Deepening of understanding of the nature of the Church's

worship led to the need for fuller understanding of the Scriptures. Biblical theology and research have developed enormously in recent years, but it is significant that we do not yet possess a translation of the Bible into our own tongue from the original languages as do other parts of the world. This is not to decry Mgr Knox's great work which was truly a gigantic undertaking brought to a successful issue, but the fact that he translated from the Vulgate, that so far as can be seen nothing else was considered, has its significance.

The principal features of the theological renewal to which I have referred very shortly can perhaps be summed up by saying that the renewal has resulted in a re-emphasis on the centrality of the passion, death, and resurrection of our Lord—the paschal mystery—leading to a greater doctrinal insight, to an enriched eucharistic theology, a wider understanding of the theology of the sacraments and, in these apocalyptic times, a more integral eschatology.

In considering the religious writing of our day it is impossible not to be struck by the change that is taking place; new ideas, fundamental ideas that have previously very largely been lost sight of, are to the fore. But how much of all this is native to our country and how far are we lagging behind, following in the wake of others whom we seem content to allow to do our thinking for us? We have only to consider the amount of translated work, principally from the French and German, that is published annually to realize that our own contribution is not very large. There are advantages, of course, in having at our disposal the best religious thought of Europe in our own language. But there is a danger too. We are apt to adopt conclusions, to take up positions without perhaps doing the necessary preliminary thinking. Our practical approach sometimes leads us into difficulties. Translation of foreign works are very useful, but they do not dispense us from the original thought and hard effort needed to produce our own religious books.

The various movements of our times—Catholic Action, Young Christian workers, secular institutes, and so on—that have largely come to us from abroad, have obviously contributed something to the impact of Catholicism in this country. And each of them, in one way or another, has led to a consider-

able specialized literature, even if most of it is to be found in booklets and periodicals. Yet in the sphere of religious writing of this sort there lurks again the danger alluded to above, of an *ad hoc* spirituality, an enclosed garden, so to say, specially thought out for a determined *milieu* or state of life.

In the book already quoted Fr Bouyer tells how an attempt was made to give the diocesan clergy a special spirituality so that they should not be indebted to the religious Orders. Following this came the idea of defining a lay spirituality in clear contrast with monastic and sacerdotal spirituality. It was forgotten that the first monks, the creators of monastic spirituality, desired on a last analysis to be no more than devout lay-folk. From such ideas it was but a step in certain Catholic Action circles to propose a workers' spirituality, a student spirituality, even a spirituality of agricultural workers.

It looks as if there was some confusion between the proper concern to impregnate with the spirituality of the Gospel the problems belonging to each specialized *milieu* and a vague idea which, could it be defined, would amount to refashioning the Gospel according to the mentality, the professional distortions, the prejudices or fads current in different circles.¹

In this way would quickly arise a Christianity, or rather a whole host of Christianities, of classes and cliques, such as were envisaged by St Paul's exclamation: "Here is no more Gentile and Jew, no more circumcised and uncircumcised; no one is barbarian, or Scythian, no one is slave or free man; there is nothing but Christ in any of us" (Col. iii, 11).

Spiritual reading in most of the past centuries covered by this series, certainly in the last two or three, conjures up the idea of a regular exercise by the devout, by clergy and religious, undertaken for the particular purpose of personal progress towards perfection and confined to certain well defined matters—prayer, the virtues, eucharistic communion as a personal practice of devotion, the lives of the saints and so on—and very often confined to certain well-tried books.² Certainly nowadays

¹ Bouyer, op. cit., p. 24.

² Not so very long ago the only spiritual reading in one novitiate was Rodriguez on Christian perfection read aloud to the novices.

we tend to cast our net wider and, if we do not follow von Hügel's advice to his niece to begin with the British Museum catalogue of Greek coins, we can appreciate to some extent the reasons that were behind his advice. Gradually the Bible is coming to occupy its proper place again, and books about the Bible proliferate. Books also on the worship of the Church, on theology in all its aspects, biographies of the saints, the Fathers in English (two series are in course of publication) are abundant. All these are the elements of what should form the intellectual baggage, the religious culture of the Christian in the world today as in the past. Our greatest need in the modern world is for an adult Catholicism and to this our spiritual writers of the past in company with their modern counterparts can lead us, the older ones reminding us, perhaps, of much that we tend to overlook in our own times.

LANCELOT C. SHEPPARD

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

THE GELASIAN SACRAMENTARY

MUCH obscurity surrounds the history of Roman liturgical books; this is especially true of the Service Book called the *Gelasianum*, which has come down to us in one complete manuscript, the *Vaticanicus Reginensis* 316, according to modern scholars to be dated circa A.D. 750. The locality in which it was written has been much discussed. Earlier experts such as Duchesne suggested Saint-Denis of Paris.¹ Wilmart pointed to the *scriptorium* of the ancient Abbey of Corbie,² but modern critics such as Bischoff and Lowe³ are inclined to point to the nunnery of Chelles near Paris. For centuries the Gelasian Sacramentary has been linked with the name of Pope Gelasius I (492-496), and on this account has long been an object of study and no little frustration to scholars. The need, therefore,

¹ *Origines du culte chrétien* (1925), pp. 132-42.

² *Bibl. Apostol. Vaticanae codices . . . Reginenses, II* (Romae, 1945), p. 203.

³ *Codices latini antiquiores*, part VI (Oxford, 1953), pp. xxi-xxii.

for a thorough systematic study of its contents has long been felt. Although an attempt to meet this need was made by the late Abbé Bourque,¹ Canon Chavasse² has studied the whole problem anew on much broader lines.

The Canon's work does not make for easy reading. It is a detailed minute examination of the contents of the Sacramentary. These are not as straightforward as they appear to be. Much is of local Gallican origin, and it is with this material that the author begins his study. As a preliminary, he discusses the various studies and monographs concerning the origin of the *Gelasianum* which have appeared prior to his work. He traces the history of its attribution to Pope Gelasius by ninth-century authors, and outlines the method he has used in his analysis and the main conclusions at which he has arrived.

After this lengthy introduction Canon Chavasse takes his reader by the hand, conducting him on a long and fascinating voyage of discovery. Courage is needed, for the author expects his reader to tread the tortuous ways he himself has followed in the elaboration of his thesis. The limits of a review article prevent a detailed account of the journey. It must suffice to point out the more interesting landmarks.

As is well known, *Reginensis 316* is divided into three books or parts. The first deals with the *Temporale*, the second with the *Sanctorale* and the third comprises the *Canon Missae*, various masses *per dominicis diebus* and other miscellaneous matter. This vast material is not homogeneous. Some of it is non-Roman in origin. Hence the author sets out by tracing a path through the additions made in Gaul at the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century. These additions comprise the Rituals of Ordination, the Consecration of Virgins, the Dedication of Churches, the Blessings of Holy Water and the Rites of Burial. Having thus found his bearings, so to speak, the Canon begins his journey in earnest by seeking to establish that as early as Pope Innocent I (401-417) Rome enjoyed three distinct zones of liturgical practice. The first of these was

¹ *Etude sur les Sacramentaires Romains. I Les Textes Primitifs*, pp. 173-298. (*Studi di Antichità Christiana*, xx (Rome, 1949).)

² *Le Sacramentaire Gélasien (Vaticanus Reginensis 316): Sacramentaire presbytéral en usage dans les Titres romains au VII^e siècle* by Antoine Chavasse. xxxix+817 pp. (*Bibliothèque de Théologie, Série IV*, Vol. I.) Desclée (Paris-Tournai, 1958).

the Lateran basilica reserved to the strictly papal rite of the *domnus apostolicus*, a rite observed also whenever the pontiff celebrated in one or other of the stational churches. The second zone of liturgical practice was comprised by the various parish churches within the confines of the city: the *tituli*. These had their own rites and customs distinct from that of the papal basilica of the Lateran. A proof of this is the description of the Holy Week Services contained in the *Gelasianum*. The third zone of yet another divergent liturgical practice was that furnished by churches established outside the city walls and serving the cemeteries. It is the liturgy of the second zone which has been preserved in the Gelasian Sacramentary, but not without additions to its original material and a good deal of recasting.

There is much of interest for the parochial clergy of today in the chapters which Canon Chavasse consecrates to a description of the rites of Holy Week and the administration of Baptism and Penance in the *tituli* of sixth-seventh-century Rome, all preserved in the Gelasian Sacramentary.

Having thus disposed of some interesting scenes of his journey, the author settles down to a scientific study of the general structure of *Reginensis 316*. It is at this point that the reader is led among the labyrinthine ways of the author's mind. It is here that he gives the impression of leaving no stone unturned, no twist and turn of the road unexplored, which may add plausibility to his thesis. His study deals successively with the *Temporale* and the *Sanctorale*, and the miscellaneous matter of the Third Book. He endeavours to show how *Reginensis 316* is a hybrid production of the seventh century; that its *Sanctorale* is the result of the fusion of two series of pre-existing Mass formularies belonging to two different liturgical types: one archaic, the other more modern. These diverse strata correspond to the various ecclesiastical regions of Rome, and their liturgy is non-papal and strictly presbyterial. Book III contains monastic elements used by the Roman monastic communities and showing some affinity with the Benedictine Rule. In order to round off his conducted tour and to give the participants their money's worth, the Canon next proceeds to a detailed study of the sources of the Gelasian Sacramentary

and an examination of its relationship with other liturgical books. Here again one is fascinated by the author's showmanship. These are ably written pages. The whole history of the growth of the Sacramentary, from the period when it was customary for the celebrant to compose his own prayer formularies, to the point when the official organized Mass book came into existence, is outlined. The *scrinium* of the Lateran basilica would have preserved many a prayer formulary due to the pen of Leo the Great, Gelasius and Vergilius. Some time during the sixth century this material was used for the composition of an official *Liber Sacramentorum*. Such a book must have been in existence before the year 600, for it forms the basis of the later Sacramentaries: *Gelasianum*, *Gregorianum*, *Gothicum*, *Bobbiense*, etc. Much that the author has to say concerning this non-extant source, of which no-one has ever heard, may be true. It may even solicit notional assent, but the impression remains that there is a good deal of doubt about it. He would be a brave man indeed who would subscribe to all that is put forward as fact without more ado. This impression is accentuated up and down the whole work.

One instance of the author's tendency to gloss over an inconvenient fact must suffice. His treatment of the question of the liturgical period of Septuagesima is far from satisfactory. On page 215 he admits that all the ancient Roman liturgical books provide for Septuagesima, yet he states categorically that such a liturgical period was unknown at Rome during the pontificate of Gregory the Great. Now the first indication that this is not the case is the rubric attached to Homily 19 of Gregory the Great's Homilies on the Gospel: *Habita ad populum in Basilica beati Laurentii martyris. Dominica in Septuagesima.* On page 216, note 10, the Canon is at pains to deny the authenticity of this rubric. He suggests that the homily in question was preached on the feast of St Laurence (10 August), but is careful not to say for which year. To support his opinion he quotes the following words of the homily: "Praesenti anno . . . Mense nuper elapso . . . atque a tempore illo nuncusque . . ." as indicating that the month of July had just passed. Now, I find it hard to follow the Canon's interpretation of this passage, and in order to elucidate the problem I beg to quote more fully from this same homily.

In his homily Gregory cites the following example of God's mercy: "*Rem, fratres, quae nuper contigit refero . . . Praesenti anno in monasterio meo . . . frater quidem ad conuersionem uenit.*" He goes on to relate how a brother of the above monk was also received into his monastery, and lived a very ungodly life until: "*Mense autem Iulio nuper elapsus, huius quam nostis pestilentiae clade percussus est: qui ad extremum ueniens urgeri coepit ut animam redderet.*" The monk in question at death's door perceives a dragon ready to devour him, but delivered by the prayer of the brethren, recovers sufficiently to live a more godly life: "*Mox autem seruiturum se Deo et esse monachum deuouit; atque a tempore illo nuncusque febribus premitur, doloribus fatigatur.*" Now the salient features of this passage are these: (1) the monk is struck down by the plague; (2) this happened in July; (3) in the year the homily was preached. Have we any means of being more precise? Some years ago the Canon¹ used this passage to date the Gregorian Sacramentary as being composed for the year 595, but use of it here is confined to the simple statement that "the *Gregorianum* was written for a given year". However, Gregory relates the above story on two other occasions, which allow us to date more precisely Homily 19.

In Homily 38 he says: "*Ante biennium frater quidem . . . In hac autem pestilentia, quae nuper huius urbis populum magna ex parte consumpsit, percussus in inguine perductus est ad mortem.*"

Dialogues, IV, 38: "*In hac autem pestilentia, quae nuper huius urbis populum magna ex parte consumpsit, percussus in inguine perductus est ad mortem.*" Now we know that the plague raged in Rome from January 590 to August of the same year. At least it had abated sufficiently to permit Gregory's consecration on 3 September of that year. From homily 38 we learn that the incident concerning the monk took place *ante biennium*, and it is generally admitted that the Homilies on the Gospel were preached during the years 591–2, for they were revised and published by Gregory in 593. Thus Homily 38 was preached towards the end of 592 in *basilica beati Clementis martyris*. Thus the phrase *ante biennium* describes suitably the incident of July 590. What are we to understand by *nuper, praesenti anno . . .*? The term *nuper* is ordinarily used to describe an event after a

¹ Cf. *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, xxxvii (1950), p. 143 sq.

certain lapse of time, and it is well known that the Romans dated their year from March to March. Thus the most natural explanation of the facts is that Homily 19 was pronounced in the early part of the year 591, most probably for Septuagesima Sunday, which fell that year on 11 February. This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence of the *Gregorianum* (Hadrianum) wherein the collects for Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima Sundays form a whole and are certainly due to the pen of St Gregory.¹ However inconvenient it may be for the dating of the primitive *Gregorianum* to admit the observance of Septuagesima Sunday at Rome during the pontificate of St Gregory the Great, the fact cannot be denied.

The chief merit of Canon Chavasse's labours is that he has demonstrated the existence of several liturgical rites in seventh-eighth-century Rome. This in itself is no small achievement. Much that has been looked upon as established liturgical fact over the past fifty years will have to be re-thought in the light of this book. For this alone the author deserves the gratitude of all serious liturgical scholars. To crown his achievement the Canon has added over 100 pages of valuable comparative tables, lists of Biblical references, and of other liturgical documents: Epistle Books, Gospel Books, Antiphonaries, etc. A table of proper names and an alphabetical list of contents bring the work to a fitting conclusion.

HENRY ASHWORTH, O.S.B.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TRANSPLANTATION OF KIDNEYS *inter vivos*

Is it morally justifiable for a healthy man to permit the transplantation of an organ from himself to another, as in the cases recently reported in the Press (cuttings supplied), in which a single kidney was transferred—(a) from one identical twin to the other—(b) from a father to his son, the object in each case being to save the recipient's life? (R. H. B.)

¹ See the proofs in my article: *The Liturgical Prayers of St Gregory the Great*, *Traditio*, XV (1959), pp. 129–30.

REPLY

The moral issue raised by homologous transplantations of the kind in question is still very much in the balance, though this is hardly surprising, when one considers how recent and rare they are in medical practice. Corneal transplantation has indeed become a routine operation, but since the corneal tissue is always, in practice, obtained from cadavers ("eye-banks" exist for the purpose), or from eyes which have had to be removed for pathological reasons, no moral difficulty arises in their regard. Nor is there any moral problem when the mutilation involved in the donor of the transplant is directed equally to his or her own physical benefit, as in one of the earliest reported cases of ovarian homografts, when ovaries were interchanged between two sisters, one of whom suffered from amenorrhea and the other from hypermenorrhea.¹ The problem is more or less limited to the type of case mentioned by our questioner, in which a living donor sacrifices a healthy organ or member solely for the benefit of the recipient. It is still a surgical rarity,² and theological opinion is still very much divided as to its lawfulness. It would seem fair to say, however, that provided the mutilation suffered by the donor does not imperil his life or substantially impair his functional integrity, and the benefit to the recipient is proportionate to the damage suffered by the donor, the opinion of those who regard the sacrifice as a permissible act of charity is probable enough to be safely followed in practice, unless and until the Holy See decides authoritatively to the contrary.

The reason for doubting or denying the lawfulness of a sacrifice which to anyone but a moralist seems positively noble lies in the difficulty of reconciling it with the Thomistic principle, confirmed by Pius XI in *Casti connubii* and by Pius XII in his address of 14 September 1952,³ according to which

¹ Kelly, *Medico-Moral Problems* (1958 edition), p. 248.

² The first successful renal transplantation between identical twins appears to have been that reported in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 28 January 1956: since when, according to an expert questioned in a recent TV programme, there have been about ten further cases reported in America.

³ *Summa Theol.*, 2a 2ae, qu. 65, a. 1: *Casti connubii*, C.T.S., p. 33; Pius XII, *A.A.S.*, XLIV, 1952, p. 782.

the direct mutilation of one's body is permissible only in so far as it serves the good of the body as a whole, because man has charge rather than ownership of his body. On this ground, almost before organic transplantations *inter vivos* had become a practical issue, some authors condemned them as unjustifiable.¹

One of the first to suggest that a principle formulated before men could help each other in this way, needed re-thinking in the light of modern possibilities, was Fr Bert J. Cunningham, C.M., in a dissertation presented in 1944 to the Catholic University of Washington.² He argued to the probable lawfulness of homologous transplantation, with the reservations explained above, from the natural and supernatural bonds which unite every man to his fellow men. He further contended that charity allows one to do for others what one may lawfully do for oneself, and that if, as all agree, the donation of blood for transfusion and of skin for grafting is permissible, there is no intrinsic reason for excluding graver mutilations from the scope of charity merely by reason of their gravity, because *maius aut minus non variant speciem*.³

The question, once raised, was discussed in the theological periodicals with a fair balance of opinion. When, for example, in 1954–5, it was debated in *Perfice Munus* and *Palestra del Clero*, the participants were evenly divided, three taking the affirmative view, three the negative.⁴ Then on 14 May 1956, came the papal allocution to the Italian Society of Corneal Donors, in which Pius XII, though expressly limiting his immediate attention to transplantation from cadavers, observed *en passant* that one of the arguments advanced in support of transplantation *inter vivos* was ill founded. It assumed, he said, that the members of an individual are parts of the total organism constituted by "humanity" in almost the same way as they are parts of the individual human organism, and from this it contended that, just as it is permissible to sacrifice a particular member for the sake of the human organism, so it should be

¹ Cf. Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa T.M.*, II, n. 328, 4; Jorio, *T.M.*, II, n. 168.

² *The Morality of Organic Transplantation*. For a penetrating but appreciative review by Dr John McCarthy, cf. *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (March 1946), pp. 193 ff.

³ It should be noted that Noldin and Jorio justify these donations of blood and skin on the ground that they do not involve real mutilations.

⁴ Cf. a summary in *Theological Studies* (December 1955), p. 572.

permissible to sacrifice such a member for the sake of the organism "humanity". The object, he declared, was laudable, "mais la methode proposée, et la preuve dont on l'appuie, sont erronées".¹

This clearly ruled out one of the principal arguments on which Fr Cunningham's thesis relied. Indeed some took "la methode proposée" to refer to transplantation *inter vivos*, and concluded that it too was condemned.² However, since the Pope had begun by disclaiming any intention of settling that issue ("de celle-ci Nous ne parlerons pas aujourd'hui"), many commentators found it difficult to believe that he had then proceeded to do so, and Fr J. J. Lynch, s.j., who lists their names (G. Kelly, R. Carpentier, F. J. Connell, G. Bosio, and J. Connery), suggests that the rejected "methode proposée" must be taken to refer simply to the false parallelism which had been used as a method of argumentation.³

If this be accepted, there still remains the argument from the law of charity, by which the sacrifice of blood and skin for the benefit of others is justified. Some evade this argument by distinguishing between minor and easily reparable losses of this kind and mutilations properly so called. But Dr John Marshall, an eminent English Catholic physician, assures us in a recent work that "this distinction has little basis medically, for there are several organs which are less vital to a person's well-being than is a considerable quantity of blood. The distinction is entirely one of degree and not of kind."⁴ Nor is the distinction altogether consistently applied, because all admit that a mother is allowed and may even be bound in charity to undergo a Caesarean section, which is a mutilation by any reckoning, for the sake of her child.

It must be admitted that the parallel between what one may do for oneself and what one may do for one's neighbour is incomplete; thus it is agreed that no one may completely sacrifice a function, e.g. by removal of both eyes, or both gonads, for the bodily benefit of another, and yet one may certainly do so for one's own health. On the other hand, charity certainly

¹ Cf. the text reproduced in THE CLERGY REVIEW, November 1956, p. 686.

² So Fr de Letter, s.j., in *Clergy Monthly* (November 1956), p. 384.

³ *Theological Studies* (June 1957), p. 229.

⁴ *The Ethics of Medical Practice* (London, 1960), p. 64.

justifies many actions affecting one's bodily welfare that would not otherwise be lawful; for though one may never commit direct suicide for another, one may directly omit to conserve one's life or health for another whose need is correspondingly grave. Nor is it correct to represent the sacrifice of an organ for another as entailing no benefit to the donor and therefore contrary to the charity he primarily owes himself; for in determining the limits of charity, account should surely be taken of the spiritual gain to the donor in the form of supernatural merit. And finally, there must surely be some significance in the fact that the Christian conscience, far from being shocked by sacrifices such as those reported in the question, reacts to them with the same instinctive approval as it shows to the risking of life itself for the sake of others in danger.

Whatever be the value of these arguments, the affirmative view appears to be still holding its own in the recent appraisals of medico-moralists. Niedermeyer rejects it,¹ and Healy thinks it "in disfavour".² But Paquin admits that it "still retains a certain probability",³ Marshall calls it "a tenable view",⁴ O'Donnell concedes to it "solid probability",⁵ Tesson maintains that, until the Church says otherwise, "it can be upheld and serve as a rule of action",⁶ and Kelly, dealing in particular with renal transplantation, concludes that "as long as the controversy is not settled in favour of those who object to organic transplantation, homografts of this kind should be permitted, provided they are not contrary to good medicine".⁷

As we write, the newspapers announce the death, eight weeks after the operation, of the son mentioned in the question. They add that the father has made a normal recovery and that, of the identical twins, the donor is back at work and the recipient convalescing. Except in the case of identical twins, to judge from expert comment, the hostile reaction of the recipient's body to alien tissues is such that, until it can be safely

¹ *Précis de Médecine Pastorale* (1957), p. 299.

² *Medical Ethics* (1956), p. 141.

³ *Moral et Médecine* (1957), p. 25.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 66.

⁵ *Morals in Medicine* (1959), p. 127.

⁶ *Cahiers Laennec* (1956, n. 1), p. 33.

⁷ Op. cit. (1958), p. 252.

and effectively prevented, the gain to the recipient is most unlikely to compensate the loss to the donor.

SAYING A PUBLIC MASS AFTER INADVERTENTLY BREAKING FAST

A priest who, with due authorization, has a well-attended Mass every evening inadvertently breaks his fast one afternoon. It is due to his exhortations that the Mass is well attended. May he, in such circumstances, proceed to say Mass? ("Perplexed.")

R E P L Y

With minor modifications, this question keeps recurring. In two previous replies,¹ we reported that, as far as our information went, commentators were morally unanimous in holding that the prescribed period of fasting must be observed with mathematical exactitude, "de momento ad momentum", as canon 34 has it; nor have we since noted any appreciable movement of opinion to the contrary. Applying this doctrine to the case of inadvertent breach of the fast,² we could only conclude that, since inadvertence does not excuse from full observance of the fast, a priest who has broken it is *per se* bound to postpone the celebration of his Mass until he has completely complied with the law. The fact that a goodly number of people have responded to his exhortation to attend the Mass does not substantially affect this conclusion.

To say "*per se*", however, is to imply that there may be a way round the obligation *per accidens*, and indeed there is, if the circumstances of the particular case are such as to justify the application of the accepted moral principle that "the obligation of a positive law *generally* ceases when its observance is accidentally conjoined with grave damage or inconvenience".³ In this particular context, special attention must be paid to

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, XLIV, January 1959, p. 36: XLV, February 1960, p. 105.

² Op.cit., XLIV, May 1959, p. 302.

³ Genicot-Gortebecke, *Inst. T.M.*, I, n. 134.

the qualification "generally". Authors have always been prepared to admit as a sufficient excuse the avoidance of grave scandal, defamation of the celebrant, or serious offence to the congregation, but, prior to the first break in the rigidity of the fasting discipline, not even the fact that the congregation would otherwise be unable to attend a Mass of *obligation* was considered by the Holy Office to be, in itself, a sufficient excuse.

Now that the severity of the old discipline has been officially abandoned in favour of one which caters primarily for the needs of the faithful, the necessity of providing a Mass of obligation can safely be regarded as providing a sufficient excuse from the full observance of the law; though it should be remembered that the very reduction of the fasting period may make it possible to combine the provision of a Mass with full observance of the law, at the cost of a brief postponement involving only a minor inconvenience to celebrant and congregation. As for the case put by "Perplexed", in which the Mass, though well attended, is not one of obligation, the common opinion would of course allow the priest to begin his Mass before he had completed the required fast, if he could not otherwise avoid grave scandal, loss of good name, or serious offence to those whom he has encouraged to come; but we have not as yet observed any tendency among commentators to make him the same allowance merely in order to spare him a blush or the congregation a minor disappointment. It might be suggested that the Holy Office itself gave a lead towards liberality when it ruled that "if a priest who has to celebrate Mass twice or thrice should inadvertently take wine also in the ablution, he is not forbidden to say his second or third Mass";¹ and on this ground one commentator would allow a priest who has inadvertently broken his fast by a few minutes to begin a scheduled Mass at the appointed time.² But though this ruling may eventually engender a liberal opinion in regard to inadvertent breaches of the fast generally, sufficient support to make such an opinion extrinsically probable has not yet, as far as we are aware, been forthcoming.

L. L. McR.

¹ Instruction appended to *Christus Dominus*, n. 8.

² Fr C. L. Parres, *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, August 1959, p. 1040.

SUPPRESSED FEASTS AND TITULARS

What has to be done regarding feasts that have been suppressed by the new rubrics if they are the patronal or titular feasts of a place or church? (X.)

REPLY

When a church or oratory is consecrated, or at least solemnly blessed, it is given a Titular, which may be a Divine Person, a Mystery, a sacred object (e.g. the Holy Cross), or a saint, in whose name and to whose honour the church or oratory is founded, is consecrated or solemnly blessed, and after whom it is named (G.J.C. canon 1168). The feast of the Titular is solemnly kept each year with special liturgical privileges (cf. *Codex Rubricarum*, nn. 45b, 358f), and is provided for in the calendar of the diocese or Order to which the church belongs.

In the Apostolic Letter *Rubricarum Instructum* (25 July 1960) which brought the new Codex of liturgical law into being, Pope John ordered that, with all possible speed, calendars and Propers, diocesan and religious, should be revised and brought into line with the new rubrics. The Sacred Congregation of Rites added to the new Code (A.A.S., 1960, p. 730) a Declaration giving some general principles about this revision and promising more detailed directions. These have now been embodied in an Instruction dated 14 February 1961, and published in April.

In the *Variationes* which accompanied the new Codex (A.A.S., 1960, p. 786) eight feasts were suppressed, and among these five (§8, nn. 8b, c, d, g and h) may be titular feasts of a church or oratory. Accordingly, provision is made in the new Instruction to replace them, as follows:

- (a) The feast of the Finding of the Holy Cross (3 May) is replaced by that of the Triumph of the Holy Cross (14 September);
- (b) that of St John before the Latin Gate (6 May) by his feast on 27 December;

(c) that of the Apparition of the Archangel Michael (8 May) by his feast on 29 September;

(d) for the feast of St Peter *ad Vincula* (3 August) is substituted the feast of 29 June; and

(e) for the feast of the Finding of St Stephen (3 August) his feast on 26 December.

Furthermore, the new Instruction (§33) suppresses a number of "feasts of devotion" (among them that of the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus); and orders the feast of St Philumena (11 August in certain places)¹ to be expunged² from any calendar in which it occurs.

Once a church or oratory has received a Titular at its consecration or solemn blessing this may not be changed without leave of the Holy See (cf. C.J.C. canon 1168¹; S.R.C. 2719, 2853). Accordingly, a church that has hitherto had "Saint" Philumena as Titular must now choose a new Titular and apply to the Holy See for an indult to make the necessary change (cf. Instruction, §34).

MISSA PRO POPULO

What are the changes in the new law about the *Missa pro populo* (Parochus)?

REPLY

As a consequence of the new code of rubrics a fresh list of the days on which the *Missa pro populo* is of obligation—in accordance with the Code of Canon Law, canons 399¹ and 466¹—was issued by the S. Congregation of the Council on 3 December 1960, and came into force on 1 January 1961.

The total number of days on which the obligation of this Mass occurs remain the same as formerly, 88; made up of 52 Sundays, 10 holy days, and 26 other feasts, but some of the days in this last category have been changed. Among the feasts of the first class in the Universal Church which are not holy days of

¹ The feast never appeared in the calendar of the Universal Church.

² For the reasons for this, see an article in THE CLERGY REVIEW, August 1956.

obligation, the duty of the *Missa pro populo* no longer arises on the Monday and Tuesday of Easter and Whitsuntide weeks, but the feasts of the Sacred Heart, the Most Precious Blood (1 July) and St Joseph the Workman (1 May) have been added to the list.

Of the feasts of I class in particular calendars, formerly only the feast of the patron of the nation and that of the patron "of the place" were on the list; now there are four feasts of Patrons, i.e. the chief Patron of the nation and that of the "place" (now defined as town or city) as heretofore, and also the feast of the chief Patron of the region or province (ecclesiastical or civil) and of the Patron of the diocese.¹ Three other feasts of I class in particular calendars have been added, i.e., the anniversary of the dedication² of the cathedral of the diocese and of one's own church, and the feast of the Titular of one's own church (not of the cathedral).

To the II class feasts of the Apostles on which the obligation of the *Missa pro populo* occurs have been added those of St Luke and St Mark. On the other hand the obligation has been removed from 3 May (the feast of the Finding of the Holy Cross having been suppressed), and from the feasts of St Stephen, St Silvester, St Anne and St Lawrence.

It seems that if there are several chief Patrons (*aequi principes* as they used to be described) the Mass must be offered on the feasts of them all.³ Presumably this applies also if a church has more than one Titular so that there is more than one Titular feast.

This distinction formerly made between *festa feriata* (with the full obligation of assisting at Mass and abstaining from servile work) and *non feriata* has been dropped in connexion with the *Missa pro populo*.

Concessions or indults granted in the past by the S. Congregation of the Council to certain dioceses reducing the numbers of days on which the *Missa pro populo* must be offered remain in

¹ A Patron must be a duly constituted one (see THE CLERGY REVIEW, May 1960, pp. 303-5).

² This means a church which is consecrated (cf. new rubrics, n. 45a), not one which has been only solemnly blessed, but both of these kind of churches have a Titular (cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, May 1960, p. 303).

³ *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (1961), p. 63.

force in so far as they are not in conflict with the new rubrics,¹ for they are temporary exceptions, and the revocatory clause at the end of the decree of the S. Congregation of the Council, *contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus* is not detailed enough to rescind a dispensation granted in a particular rescript.²

J. B. O'C.

CORRESPONDENCE

PARISH POOLS AND COLLECTIONS

Sir,

Though not exactly an enthusiast for the Pools, it seems to me that the alternative is not between Pools and Collections but between Pools and Benefactions and as super-tax, etc., has put the latter out of the reckoning for most priests on a big enough scale to meet the enormous costs of extraordinary expenditure, church building, school funds, etc., we may well give thanks that Pools have come providentially to replace them. We older priests well remember the affluent Miss XYZ or Lady ABC who received almost Royal honours at all diocesan and parochial functions when they attended. It may be questioned in these "democratic" days whether it is less dignified to seek the weekly bob from "sporting Sam" for the Pool, than kow-towing to the wealthy patrons of days gone by: I suppose it is not seriously suggested the Pools should be given up because of their supposed immorality. The smallness of the contribution and of the expected or hoped for rewards saves them from the stigma and evils of real gambling.

However, whether we have Pools or Benefactors the need for collections remains, and they should increase in proportion to the extra costs of ordinary expenses in running a parish and the extra affluence of most people. I feel sure this increase could be attained to a large extent if one could answer the question I have been asked more than once, how much should a man give to the Church? This, of course, must vary with circumstances, but an authoritative and just statement from the Hierarchy as to the principle on which a man should base his contributions would be a guide, and many of our

¹ Ibid.; p. 64.

² Cf. *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, March 1961, p. 200.

good honest lay-folk would follow it. The difficulty is to find the principle and some suggestions in your columns might help. To start the ball rolling I would suggest that a man should take his gross income, subtract his income tax and national insurance contributions, then divide the net income by the number of people dependent on it, i.e. a single man, by one, a married couple by two, man, wife and two children by four, etc., then give 2½ per cent of the remainder to the Church. This would not in some cases be a very big sum, but a good deal more in others than is given now. I regret that I have no tax tables to give examples except for the £10 a week working man. A single man on this wage would give about 30s. a week in tax and stamp. Thus his contribution to the Church would be 2½ per cent of £8 10s. (4s. a week). A married man without children would give about 18s. in tax and stamp. Thus he would divide £9 2s. by two and give to the Church 2½ per cent of £4 11s. (about 2s. 6d.). A man with a family on £10 could afford very little and it works out under a shilling at most. It would be interesting to apply this principle to higher incomes if anyone has the necessary tax table. It should also be noted that in cases of people paying income tax, their contribution can be increased about 75 per cent by a seven-year covenant on which the tax is reclaimed.

The Priest's House,
West Grinstead,
Horsham, Sussex.

(Rev.) H. C. FINCHAM

THE EASTER VIGIL

Sir,

Whilst I am grateful to Fr O'Reilly for his kind remark about my article, I cannot agree with the reasons he gives for the alleged unpopularity of the Easter Vigil. When he says that "the Vigil got shunted into a liturgical siding at an early date", if he is referring to the old morning Service of Holy Saturday, with its scanty congregations, I should think that history shows that there are many other factors besides its structure that caused its neglect by the people at large. If, on the contrary, he is referring to the Restored Vigil, I think it would be premature to judge it a failure. One hears of enthusiastic reports about it from other countries, and where, in this country, care has been taken to prepare for the Vigil, it has proved far from unsuccessful.

Although there may be five or more distinct ceremonies within it, that in itself is no condemnation. Even the Mass can be divided

into six distinguishable parts, and any of the four parts of the present Good Friday Liturgy is sufficient of an entity in itself to make a little service if it were to be performed on its own.

One could count up the number of Dominus vobiscums or incensations at Mass, or the number of genuflections at Stations of the Cross, or the number of Hail Marys in the Rosary, but the number does not deprive them of their meaning. In spite of the length and varying elements in the Vigil, the service is a coherent whole: (a) The Vigil proper, the series of appropriate lessons all pointing to the resurrection and its effects on ourselves; (b) preceding it, the service of *Light* (the production of a satisfactory symbol to stand in our present for the risen Christ, the Light of the World—His giving of His Light to all—the setting of this symbol in the place of honour—the welcome by joyous song of the risen Christ among the congregation); and (c) following the Vigil lessons, the service of *Water*—water blessed as the sacramental matter for use when new members participate in Christ's resurrection, and a graphic reminder and renewal of the great day when we rose in Christ.

As for the *Benedictus*, in this, Zachary sang in prophecy of Redemption already accomplished, which is what the resurrection means, and it always seems to me to be *par excellence* our daily commemoration of the Resurrection. How can anyone fail to see the connexion of this with Easter if he knows what Easter means?

The Vigil and its Mass are, in effect, unified by being one long proclamation that "Christ is risen—You are risen in Him", which is precisely the theme of the sermons given by SS Peter and Paul in the Acts.

I, therefore, still uphold that what is wrong is not the Vigil service but ourselves—our lack of appreciation of it. We have got to form this appreciation in our people, and this may take years of painstaking work. The Holy Father has given us the restored Vigil, but he cannot make it work in our parishes, that is for us clergy to do. Fr Charles Davis in his book *Liturgy and Doctrine* says:

The restoration of the Easter Vigil is an achievement of the liturgical movement that must be termed momentous. It will be long before it bears its full fruit; its repercussions will probably extend over centuries. Nothing short of an upheaval is required in the outlook of the average Catholic before it can be properly appreciated.

It is up to us clergy in the parishes to try to bring about this upheaval. It is no good just putting on a new form of service and

expecting good results to follow automatically. Genuine preparation and instruction is needed.

The same applies to such things as the dialogue Mass. If one starts dialogue Mass somewhat reluctantly ("because the Pope says so"), gives the people no training, and says Mass in a voice so low or so rapid that the people cannot follow, the result will be a failure—but the fault will not be with the dialogue Mass. If, however, one starts by giving "the reason why", teaches the easier responses and their meaning, and pronounces one's own Latin carefully in a clear voice, things begin to live. The people can gradually be taught to take up more and more of the Latin, and participation becomes a reality, even with what at the beginning seemed to be a rather unpromising congregation.

It is the greatest of pities if the papal command to instruct the faithful in the meaning of the Holy Week ceremonies during Lent is being to any extent disregarded. I myself have heard complaints from the laity that in some parts not a thing is said or done to help them to understand and partake in these services. Is it that we take more interest in legal minutiae, such as where the Subdeacon stands at such and such a time, or whether a bow should be profound, mediocre or slight, than in the spirit of the liturgy which is portrayed in so masterly a way in *Mediator Dei*? If it were to be reported from somewhere on the Continent that a priest celebrated the Vigil in the mother-tongue for the benefit of his peasant congregation, he would be condemned as a mad law-breaker by most of his brethren over here. But the man who neglects the spirit of the liturgy often seems to get off scot-free. We should, however, remember that the breaking of rubrics is only one of the ways we can offend in matters of liturgy. Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* very clearly condemns those who take the law into their own hands. But at the same time he condemns those who do nothing to promote the liturgy. In par. 7 of the Encyclical he says:

For while We regret that in some quarters there is little or no interest in the liturgy or understanding of it, at the same time We observe elsewhere, with anxiety and some apprehension, an undue fondness for innovation and a tendency to stray from the path of truth and prudence.

And further down (par. 8) he says:

It is therefore Our duty, in all that has been done, to praise and approve what is right and to check and condemn what is

wrong. But the lazy and indifferent must not think We are commanding them when We restrain the over-venturesome and correct those who go astray: nor must the imprudent see praise for themselves in the reproof We administer to the negligent.

There, for all of us, is the balanced view.

I should be among the first to rejoice if Rome were to allow the Vigil in English, or at least parts of it such as the Lesson-Canticle-Prayer part and the Lauds. This, it seems to me, would be a great help for the people in their understanding of, and partaking in, the service. But whilst it is in Latin we can still engender some understanding and appreciation of it, as I know from experience.

In fine, although I agree that the Restored Vigil might be improved by some changes in its structure, I should very much regret having to abandon what we have for the very truncated service suggested by Fr O'Reilly. The Vigil would then indeed be on its death-bed. We would only have to take it a stage further: bless the water privately in the sacristy and have the renewal of baptismal promises before all Easter morning Masses—and the night vigil could be finally laid to rest.

45 Broad Street, (Canon) A. S. E. BURRETT
Alresford,
Hants.

FEAST OF OUR LADY MEDIATRIX OF ALL GRACES

Sir,

The answer in the May number of THE CLERGY REVIEW about the transference of the feast of Our Lady Mediatrix of All Graces is no doubt rubrically sound. But there is another aspect. This feast on 31 May is not just a particular local feast, like one of our Anglo-Saxon saints: it was kept by a very large number of dioceses, so as to be practically world-wide. Consequently, the choice by the Holy See of this particular day for the new feast of Mary Queen can only be looked on as intentional: it was not like accidentally knocking out a purely local feast. The Holy See well knew what it was doing, and chose to do it. This is confirmed by the Encyclical *Ad Coeli Reginam*, in which the objects of the new feast are fully explained. It is clear from this that our Lady's universal mediatorship is included, as a consequence of her queenship. In other words, the new Feast is intended to include the old, under a wider title. When this is combined with the deliberate choice of 31 May, the intention seems clear.

Vol. XLVI

2E

It may be true that mere rubrical law would permit the transference. But to have two feasts of our Lady, on two successive days, the second being merely an aspect of the first, seems a strange arrangement. Would it not be better to put into the one great feast all that its foundation charter, *Ad Coeli Reginam*, quite clearly intended it to mean? It includes the mediatorship, and puts this admirably into its proper setting.

St Teresa's,
Stockton Road,
Owton Manor,
West Hartlepool

(Rev.) R. P. REDMOND

The same point was made by the Abbé Laurentin, the eminent Mariologist. He wrote in *La Vie Spirituelle* (XCII, 1955, pp. 84-5):

... n'est-ce pas surcharger le calendrier liturgique, déjà si rempli que l'on songe par ailleurs à y apporter des allégements? Le pape s'est préoccupé de cette difficulté. La nouvelle fête vient en recouvrir une autre. Le 12 janvier 1921, à la demande du cardinal Mercier et de l'Épiscopat belge, Benoît XV avait accordé à tous les diocèses ou ordres qui en feraient la demande, la fête de Marie Médiatrice qui fut fixée au 31 mai. La fête de la royauté fixée à la même date apparaît à cet égard comme une généralisation et un ressourcement de la fête très répandue de la médiation mariale. Sous un titre à la fois plus ancien en tradition, et plus facile à bien entendre, l'objet de la célébration est équivalent.

But he adds in a footnote:

Il serait prématuré de préciser ce qu'il en adviendra de la fête de la médiation. Sans doute, ici comme ailleurs, la conduite du Saint-Siège sera-t-elle très nuancée et tiendra-t-elle compte des désirs et coutumes particuliers.

It seems, then, that, although the Holy See will not ride roughshod over local feeling, the preferable course in principle is to drop the older feast and celebrate its object in the new feast.

THE EDITOR

BOOK REVIEWS

SCRIPTURE AND PATRISTICS

Witnesses to God. By Leonard Johnston (Sheed & Ward. 13s. 6d.).

SOME parts of Fr Leonard Johnston's introduction to the Scriptures have been published in THE CLERGY REVIEW and elsewhere, and here the work has been gathered together to form a simple and attractively written volume. Popular exposition, rather than the massing of learned batteries, has been aimed at, and this aim is achieved. Sometimes a generalization or an illustration strikes one as less happy, but in a work of this kind it is hard to please all. One might have had some notice, when the Gospels are being dealt with, of how Luke and John often agree together, over against the other two Gospels, particularly in their Passion-narrative, so that one cannot really set up John as an isolated phenomenon in contrast to the Synoptics. On the Old Testament figures, Abraham, Moses, David, Melchisedech, there is just enough use made of modern research to make the figures come alive, without overburdening the reader with the probabilities of this or that learned theory. It jars a little to be told (p. 7) that: "Thucydides puts speeches into the mouths of his characters which we are fairly sure were not spoken at all." Anyone who works through the late Professor Gomme's careful analysis of what Thucydides himself said about his aim in reporting speeches will have more reason to trust such reporting than the German critics would have been ready to allow. The chapter on Gedeon, which is made a peg to uphold a discussion of morality in the Old Testament, will be helpful to many.

The Four Gospels: An Historical Introduction. By Mgr L. Cerfaux, translated by P. Hepburne-Scott (Darton, Longman & Todd. 9s. 6d.).

COMPARISON of this work with the little work of Abbot Chapman which bears the same title, and which is now some thirty years old, gives interesting results. Where Mgr Cerfaux is tentative and discriminating about the relation of Aramaic Matthew to Greek Matthew, the Abbot will declare roundly:

Protestants from the sixteenth century onwards, because they taught the verbal inspiration of Scripture, declared the Greek St Matthew to be an original, not a translation, and this has been an almost universal dogma among Protestants up to the present day.

There is nothing about the Form-critics in the Abbot's work, but then they have counted for far less in English Scriptural scholarship than on the Continent. It was the late Bishop Blunt, Anglican bishop of Bradford, who made the most devastating criticism of them when he said that, if what they claimed was true, one would have to suppose that our Lord took all the Apostles with Him when He ascended into heaven. Mgr Cerfaux is inclined, with his acceptance of preliminary "partial syntheses", out of which the Gospels later coalesced, to give too much ground to the critics. After all, the words of St Luke's prologue, about the many who have tried to compile an account, need be no more than grandiloquence, and when he specifies that some of these were eye-witnesses and others ministers of the Word, he may mean no more than that Matthew was an eye-witness and Mark one of those useful auxiliaries of the itinerant Apostles who became known as ministers of the Word.

Mgr Cerfaux is distrustful of the Q hypothesis, but does not set about conducting the obsequies of Q with the zest that has of late been shown in Oxford. He still envisages the existence of John the Elder, though he does not let him loose upon the Gospel. Loisy is taken as a principal adversary throughout, and is refuted with the help of Lagrange, whereas no one in England would now think of making his English equivalent, the late Dr Barnes, a principal target, and the second-century dating of the Gospels which Loisy pleaded for has been so completely discredited by the evidence of the papyri that much of Loisy's fabric is now in ruins. English work on St John by Hoskyns, Barrett and the new Archbishop of Canterbury has been so largely conservative that an English reader need not be troubled with the work of refuting Bultmann's appeals to Mandean influence in the fourth Gospel. It will be seen from this review that Mgr Cerfaux does not shirk the problems of the Gospel background but to an English reader some of the discussion must inevitably seem to be aimed at somewhat unreal targets.

J. H. C.

Apostle and Apostolate. By Mgr L. Cerfaux. Translated by Donald D. Duggan. 183 pp. (Desclée & Co, Tournai. 100 fr. Belg.)

La Pédagogie de Dieu dans la Bible. By Jean Cantinat, c.m. 106 pp. (Collection Sacerdoce et Laïcat. Les Editions Ouvrières. 3.60 N.F.)

The Monks of Qumran. By Edmund Sutcliffe, s.j. 272 pp. (Burns & Oates. 30s.)

IN THE tenth chapter of St Matthew's gospel are collected together

various instructions which our Lord gave his apostles for their missionary activity. Its immediate purpose was directed to this specific occasion: "Do not go to the gentiles . . . but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." But clearly it will express principles which will guide the apostolate of every apostle, of every age. And it is from this point of view that Mgr Cerfau deals with the text in his book *Apostle and Apostolate*. He goes through the text showing what is the fundamental sense of our Lord's words, and in what sense therefore they are applicable still.

We are accustomed to meditations on the Scriptures which consist of the author's personal inspirations artificially or arbitrarily tagged on to an isolated phrase of the text. Mgr Cerfau's scholarship guarantees that this shall not be so here. He really does deal with the text of the gospel, and his reflections do grow out of the text. Only in one minor aspect may one allow a little doubt to arise: it must be remembered that these are deductions from the text, and from only one text at that; it must not be thought that we have here all that could be said about the subject in the gospel. Mgr Cerfau deals only with the spiritual needs of an apostle, giving at times the impression of being rather far removed from the world in which we live.

However, since most of us will be inclined to err on the other side, and to become too immersed in the human conditions of our work, it will be all the more salutary to be so clearly presented with the evangelical ideal of the apostolate.

Fr Cantinat's book also has some relevance to the apostolate. It deals with God's own method of drawing people, as shown in the Bible. Four aspects are chosen. The first is the aspect of witness: the whole of the Old Testament is gone through briefly, to show that God makes himself and his message known by means of men who bear witness to him. In the second the author points out how concrete God's manner of teaching is—this is to be seen in Israel's worship and in her literature. The third is a brief study of the promise, showing how God continually spurs his people on by the hope that lies ahead. The last reminds us how God himself encourages and strengthens by his presence.

The Biblical data is presented accurately and concretely, by means of numerous quotations and references; and conclusions to each chapter draw attention to the practical value of this data, for ourselves and our work.

"*Entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate,*" quotes Fr Sutcliffe at the beginning of his book on Qumran: but then proceeds to argue the necessity of his addition to the long list of works on this subject.

And, at the end of it, we may agree that it was, if not exactly necessary, at least of some use.

The book falls into two almost equal parts. The chapter headings of the first part are familiar to us—the discovery, the buildings, the doctrine of the community and so on. The second half is Fr Sutcliffe's own translation of various documents, from the Scrolls and from other sources, dealing with the Sect; followed by plentiful notes and indices.

The justification for the book is to be found in the title itself—the author is interested specifically in the community itself. Most of the material he gives is fairly familiar, but he presents it from this particular point of view. The fact that he is writing after so many other works does at least give him the advantage that he can re-examine all the material; and, for the new reader, his book is a useful *mise au point*.

The Trial of Jesus. By Josef Blinzler. Translated by Isabel and Florence McHugh. 312 pp. (The Mercier Press Ltd. 30s.)

De La Pléatitude de Dieu. Par Saint Irénée. Textes Choisis et Presentés par Roger Poelman. 109 pp. (Collection Bible et Vie Chrétienne. Editions Casterman, Editions de Maredsous. 48 fr.)

THE sub-title of Blinzler's work is: "The Jewish and Roman proceedings against Jesus Christ described and assessed from the oldest accounts." He deals with every step of our Lord's trial—the arrest, preliminary examination, proceedings before the Sanhedrin, handing over to Pilate, trial before Pilate, before Herod, the incident of Barabbas, the scourging, final sentence and actual crucifixion. Other chapters and various excursions deal with such questions as the date of the trial, the historicity of Luke's account, the character of Pilate, the archaeology of the crucifixion.

The author's purpose is to decide who was responsible for the death of our Lord—the Jews or the Romans. He gives five possibilities: that the Jews were exclusively responsible; predominantly responsible; to the same degree as the Romans; less than the Romans; not at all. As a subsidiary point, he deals with the justice of the verdict. His conclusion is that everyone concerned in this trial was guilty—the Sanhedrin primarily, the crowd as accessories, Pilate by wilful neglect of duty. He concludes also that the sentence was of course wrong; though not necessarily illegal—it was judicial murder.

That is the author's purpose. He also connects it with the question of anti-semitism: he quotes several sources to show that many Jews feel that the hatred they have experienced from Christians is

ultimately due, at least partly, to the blood of this innocent man which they called down on their own heads. This may strike one as being slightly factitious; but the occasion, and even the purpose of the book, are secondary; the book is really just all about the trial of our Lord—a mine of information about the legal aspects of the Passion. Every question is faced, every possible and even impossible answer is given due consideration. Sometimes his quest leads him far afield; for example, in considering the legality of the Sanhedrin proceedings, he has to consider what rules they should have been bound by; this leads him to the Mishna, which does in fact explicitly lay down rules of procedure; but this leads to a consideration of the dating of the Mishna; and, as an alternative, to the dating of the rules there codified; which leads in turn to a study of the dating of other rules there given. But the author shrinks from nothing in his thorough, patient, not to say relentless investigation.

This book is not spiritual reading; but it is undoubtedly the book to have if one wishes to know what there is to be said on practically any question concerning our Lord's trial.

Poelman's edition of St Irenaeus' writings, on the other hand, is that best sort of spiritual reading which is also good theology. Irenaeus marks a most interesting moment in the Church's development. Bishop of Lyons at the beginning of the third century, he had known Polycarp, who had known John, who had lain on the breast of the Lord. Thus the Church was still almost tangibly linked to its source; but on the other hand it had passed the stage of kerygmatic pronouncement, of simply handing on the faith so received. It had even passed the stage of "apology"—of defending and explaining the faith to outsiders. The time had come for explaining the faith to the Church itself, so to speak; for exploring its depths. It is the age of theologians.

The only two works of Irenaeus which are left are of this kind. The great *Adversus Haereses*, it is true, is occasioned especially by the Gnostic heresies of the day; but in refuting them he expounds positively the full content of the true faith; and this is explicitly the purpose of his *Demonstratio*.

From these works, Poelman has made selections and arranged them with brief introductory notes so as to give a representation of the full scale of Irenaeus' thought. And it is astonishing how full it is. That in fact seems to be the point of the title; Irenaeus is not actually the author of a book with such a title, but in his writings he does show an awareness of the full range of theology which would do credit to St Augustine but is extraordinary coming at the very beginning of theological development. It ranges from the purpose of God

in creating, and the presence of God in the Old Testament, to the glory of the Church in heaven. Equally remarkable is the Christocentric character of his theology—Christ in creation, Christ in the Old Testament, Christ in the world, Christ gathering in his two hands outstretched the whole world to God.

We are continually exhorted to go back to the Fathers in our theology. This little book provides an easy and most rewarding way of doing it.

Saint Jerome. By John Steinmann. Translated by Ronald Matthews. 358 pp. (Geoffrey Chapman, London. 27s. 6d.)

The Word of Life. Essays on the Bible. With a Foreword by Mgr E. J. Kissane. 123 pp. (M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin. 8s. 6d.)

ST JEROME is somehow a difficult figure to grasp. His life is such a strange mixture: a priest who probably never said Mass; popular and powerful Roman ecclesiastic and monk of the Palestine desert; bitter as an enemy and touching in his life-long friendships.

Fr Steinmann makes a very good attempt to bring order out of this tangled pattern. At the end, he almost has to confess himself defeated, and quotes the similar plight of Cavallera, a previous biographer of Jerome, who had to give up the attempt to write a synthesis of Jerome's theology—because it didn't exist. But he does give us a good idea of the confusion of the times, which is one factor which makes Jerome's life so confusing. And, above all, he does give us a vivid picture of Jerome the man.

He shows also why this strange character should be the patron of Scripture studies: not, as might be thought, because of the arrogance of his knowledge and touchiness and impatience of ignorant criticism; not even because he first made the word of God ring out over the world in the majesty of Cicero's tongue; but because with him begins the science of exegesis—the scrupulous attention to the word itself as distinct from arbitrary moralizing and allegory. The back-breaking labour that this involves, and the courage with which Jerome ceaselessly pursued it, make him a model for all who would be "servants of the Word".

The word of God is so self-evidently the basis of all true, revealed religion, that it seems strange that so thoroughly Catholic a country as Ireland should be so untouched by the Bible. There have been great individual scholars—the foreword to the Furrow Book, *The Word of Life*, is by one of the greatest, Mgr Kissane. But, on the whole, Ireland is at the moment quite as far behind the rest of the Church as England is. Fr Condon's article on the Bible and Devotion recalls

the
sto-
the
two
our
way
ews.
Mgr
ch a
and
itter
ut of
mself
bio-
syn-
give
which
us a
on of
rance
criti-
over
him
word
back-
which
would
ealed
untry
been
, The
whole,
church
ecalls

the eminently Biblical character of early Irish piety; from there, the monks carried the same learning and devotion to England; but in both countries the long years of persecution still seem to demand payment in theological penury.

The gap cannot be made up at one leap. But it is heartening to see in this little book at least an awareness of the needs of our time. It is a series of essays covering various aspects of the Bible and its relationship to the rest of our religious life; inevitably, there is a certain amount of overlapping, and quite a marked variation in standard (not only of scholarship but, it may be added, of literary style). But at least the ground has been broken, and gives us room to hope that the seed will bear fruit on a more ample scale.

L. JOHNSTON

From Shadows to Reality. By Jean Daniélou, s.j. Translated by Dom Wulstan Hibberd, o.s.b. (Burns Oates. 35s.)

THE studies on typology which Fr Daniélou published under the title of *Sacramentum futuri* have now been made available in English, after a lapse of ten years, while in the meantime his work has been challenged at some points by the Rev. Mr Hanson of Nottingham University with his *Allegory and Event* (1959). The main lines of the treatment, with its abundant patristic citations about Adam, Noah, Abraham and Isaac, Moses and Josue, are still intact, but one would have liked to see Mr Hanson's difficulties dealt with here and there. The two works were going through the press at the same time (the *Imprimatur* here is of 14 April 1959) and so the hiatus was unavoidable. Mr Hanson's chief difficulty is over the idea (unfamiliar to a Protestant) that there could be in the early Church, independently of the New Testament, a tradition of interpreting certain parts of the Old Testament typologically. It is, of course, a large assumption which Mr Hanson makes, that on the supposition that God had arranged for certain events narrated in the Old Testament to be the shadows of other events proper to the Christian dispensation, He would be bound to communicate this arrangement to us in the written pages of the New Testament and would not be free to do so in the oral teaching which Christ gave the apostles. That in fact God has sometimes let us into the secret of such a linkage, without inspiring the New Testament writers to record it, is argued by Fr Daniélou in certain specific instances where the *consensus* of the earliest Fathers points to an apostolic origin for such a feature of typology as the Eve-Mary parallel. Mr Hanson does not refute such an argument by urging that the primitive parallel was between Eve and the

Church, for the parallel is here a three-term relation, of Eve to Mary, and of Mary to the Church, as anyone may see from Apoc 12 and from the cryptic ending of the *Letter to Diognetus* (not cited by Mr Hanson): "Nor is Eve seduced, but is held to be a virgin."

Fr Daniélou is still of the opinion that the passage of the Red Sea was the primitive type of baptism, and not Josue's crossing of the Jordan. The earliest evidence he offers (apart from I Cor. x, 2) is from Tertullian, but this is quite clearly a comparison of the passage of the Red Sea with the renunciation of the devil at the beginning of the baptismal rite, a renunciation which took place *in the water* at that time. The true type of baptism was the Jordan-crossing, as Justin shows and as the *Odes of Solomon* (especially *Ode 39*) make abundantly clear. In view of the recent discovery of one of these *Odes* in a papyrus that contained I Peter and Melito's homily on the Passion, the attempts of earlier scholars to depreciate the *Odes* as possibly Gnostic must now be held to have failed, and the evidence of the *Odes* has to be taken seriously as an indication of Christian piety at the end of the first century. The translation of Fr Daniélou's book reads easily enough, but a comparison with the original shows that some short passages have been omitted by mistake, in particular one paragraph in the final statement of conclusions, which has dropped out by haplography.

The Roman Catacombs. By L. Hertling and E. Kirschbaum, s.j.
Translated by Joseph Costelloe, s.j. (Darton, Longman & Todd, paper-back. 10s. 6d.)

IN ORDER to make the Catacombs intelligible to the modern visitor, it is necessary to provide much background information about the manner of life of the early Christians, and this Fr Kirschbaum has done with the help of his colleague, Fr Hertling. The book is much more than a guide, though its simple format makes it suitable for carrying in the pocket. It is in effect an introduction to the early history of the Church, made through the medium of the existing remains, in painting, inscription and sculpture, here illustrated by some forty plates. So many Catholics go through life with the idea, here firmly rejected, that the Christians went down into the Catacombs for Mass, very much as they themselves go down into the Tube. It would be a good thing to see the book in use for sixth forms at convent schools, where all manner of up-to-date works may be available for those studying classics or history but nothing quite like this book to help the pupils to understand the early Church. The book has chapters on baptism, the Eucharist, martyrdom and

the life of the people of God. The tomb of St Peter is described and the controversies about the body of the apostle are summarized. The translator has brought the notes up to date, the German original of the book having been prepared in 1950. The only gap one notices is the absence of an account of the Gnostic or syncretist Catacombs, about which M. Carcopino has been theorizing so considerably, but that is not a topic which is essential to an understanding of the genuinely Christian remains.

Le Baptême des Enfants. By Canon J. C. Didier.

La Charité dans l'enseignement de S. Augustin. By M. Hustier.

Pré-Nestorianisme en Occident. By Mgr P. Glorieux.

Autour de la Spiritualité des Anges. By the same. (All published by Desclée & Co., Tournai, 1959. N.P.)

THE Catholic University of Lille has begun to produce a series of *dossiers* or collections of texts on theological questions which is reminiscent of the *Florilegium patristicum* produced at Bonn before the war. The texts are given in Latin (with a Latin version of any Greek passages that may occur) and there are a few notes of explanation in French. Canon Didier's work is the most ambitious effort of the four, and provides the means for studying the development of one doctrine from early times down to St Thomas Aquinas. He gives the important evidence that Polycarp was baptized in infancy, but omits the equally important addition that, according to Irenaeus, he was baptized by an apostle, a fact which establishes the apostolicity of the practice. Mgr Glorieux assembles texts which illustrate the affair of Leporius, a forerunner of the Nestorians; he had also gathered a most valuable series of patristic texts which deal with the angelic nature. In the Latin Fathers there was a tendency to allow them bodies and to take the sin of the "sons of God" in Genesis vi as an angelic act, but among the Greeks this was not so easily admitted, and St Thomas followed in this as in so much else the tradition of the Greeks. The Abbé Hustier has compiled a good selection of passages from Augustine on charity, grouping them in a logical order but paying no attention to the dating of the various texts to this or that period of Augustine's long life. These *dossiers*, designed for seminar work in the first instance, will yet be useful to many priests, especially the first-named of the four.

J. H. C.

LITERATURE

Francis Thompson: La Vie et L'oeuvre d'un poète. By Pierre Danchin (A.-G. Nizet, Paris. 28 N.F.)

IT MUST be a difficult guess whether this large book will be more useful to English or French readers. Many of the latter, we are told, make valiant efforts to read Francis Thompson and Gerard Manley Hopkins, but it may be doubted whether those intrepid spirits could possess such an acquaintance with English literature of the last seventy years as would enable them to appreciate all the comparisons, discussions and arguments that fill the latter part of this massive compendium. After many years of labour Dr Danchin, a professor of Literature in the University of Nancy, has produced a study which, if not definitive, is certainly monumental. There are here 550 large pages ($10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in.), much of it closely printed, nineteen chapters of which the first six are biographical, a twenty-page bibliography and all the usual *addenda*. But the truly remarkable feature of this huge work is the annotation. There are in the text long citations, sometimes in French, sometimes in the original, and all these are severally reproduced in the other language in the notes. Many of the notes are naturally references, but hundreds of them are lengthy paragraphs and the total number of them is over 2000. There can be very little that was ever written about Thompson that has not been somehow incorporated into this encyclopaedic work.

Every picture owes more to other pictures painted before it than it owes to nature and it seems to be much the same with writers. From boyhood Francis Thompson had been a tremendous reader. He had devoured all the poets from Dante and Chaucer to Verlaine and Verhaeren as well as the classics. The critics were quick to notice that he was in a supreme degree possessed of—or rather, possessed by—“*l'intelligence verbale*”. He invented a strange diction of his own. Readers of Donne, Cowley and Crashaw or, for that matter, of Shelley, Keats and Swinburne, were not to be greatly startled by aureate words; but Thompson's torrent of rococo Latinism “trepidant”, “impurpurate”, “coerule” and the like was something beyond expectation. It was held that there was too much artificiality. “He thinks in words,” wrote Arthur Symons, “and the rapture which he certainly attains is a rapture of the disembodied word.”

It was not till 1908, after the poet's death, that the discovery of his work was really made by the public. There was a tremendous chorus of praise mingled with astonishment, Coventry Patmore, to

whom he owed a great deal, had long before greeted him as an equal. Garvin declared that Shelley had come again. Rival poets and eminent critics agreed in praising these strange poems. To Catholics the "treasure galleon of his verse" was more than a satisfaction, it was a triumph. Great was their pride and delight when they found that the dead poet, now acclaimed by the literary world, had sung ecstatically about the Infant Jesus, the Tabernacle and the Monstrance and had even been dithyrambic about the red cassock of a cardinal. Between that time and the present, the sales of the separate brochure of *The Hound of Heaven* have reached a quarter of a million.

More critical views have since been heard. In 1936 Mr Martin Turnell wrote:

Francis Thompson's poetry has been overrated by Catholics because they accept his theology. In so far as it is a success *The Hound of Heaven* is a theological and not a poetical success. The proper place for *The Hound of Heaven* on the library shelves is not among English poetry but among devotional books.

For many the main revelation of this minute study will be not the story of Thompson's sad life or of all that the Meynell family did for the "swift and trackless fugitive", but the fact that he was a very great writer of prose. He had in fact a double career, journalist as well as poet. Many readers must know the famous essay on Shelley, which was too much for Canon Moyes, but was duly printed, later on, in THE DUBLIN REVIEW by that great editor, Wilfrid Ward. Actually Thompson wrote a great deal of literary criticism (and very brilliant it was), between 1890 and 1903, first for *The Academy* and then for *The Athenaeum*; and very valuable work in recovering and collecting it has been done by Fr Terence Connolly, s.j., of New York. Professor Danchin's splendid chapter No. 17, *Thompson prosateur*, deals fully with this important aspect of his hero's work and it is difficult to refrain from quoting some samples of Thompson's vivid utterances and memorable vignettes of striking figures. Those who have looked into *The Life and Labours of Bl. J. B. de la Salle, Health and Holiness*, and especially *St Ignatius Loyola* will surely agree that in those works Thompson reached the highest levels of his thought and of its expression. It is there that he is seen at his best.

The Christian Theatre. By Robert Speaight. (Faith and Fact Books, 115. Burns & Oates. 8s. 6d.)

THIS is a small book on a large subject but so well done as to be a

veritable *multum in parvo*. Faced with the difficult choice of describing plays written with devotional intent or of tracing the specifically Christian element through the long course of the post-classical drama, Mr Speaight has here made a rapid and readable survey of the whole field. In six chapters he deals with the Miracle Plays, the Mystery Plays, the Moralities, Renaissance drama, Shakespeare, the *Grand Siècle* in France and the contemporary theatre. It is all done with the dexterity of a man of letters who is also an accomplished and experienced actor.

The moral values in Elizabethan drama are in the main Christian values, although the immense upheaval of Renaissance and Reformation preclude anything better than occasional and intermittent Christianity, while Massinger is the only English dramatist of that era who clearly approaches Catholicism. Shakespeare, of course, is the old, well-worn subject of that debate. Mr Speaight here follows the lines of his *Nature in Shakespearean Tragedy* (see THE CLERGY REVIEW, October 1955), using the same ingenuity and, it must be admitted, the same exaggeration, to extract theology as well as philosophy from such of the plays as more readily lend themselves to that process. *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Measure for Measure* are well enough; but it would seem that in bringing in *The Merchant of Venice* and *All's Well* he goes beyond the limit of his terms of reference. Much more so, indeed, is this the case with the pages on *The Tempest*, a play in which there is no trace of anything Christian. That flimsy Renaissance masque, which has no resemblance either to the Comedies or the Tragedies, which is void of real characterization or dramatic tension, and is explicitly based on Renaissance sorcery, is summed up in the magician's declaration that the whole visible material world will, one day, simply vanish (like the luxurious table) and that our lives, which are already dreams, are merely rounded with a sleep. That stuff, commonly taken for deathless poetry, is still further removed from anything resembling Christianity than the agnosticism so evident in *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *Lear*. It must be only by the result of long familiarity, habit and convention, that anyone can read theology into a composition of that kind. We all know that Shakespeare by sheer genius converted a number of absurd and incredible stories into convincing drama, even though he sometimes undid his own effects, as in *Measure for Measure*, where Isabella at the end forgets her aggressive virginity (which has given rise to so much heated argument) and pairs off with the Duke after the manner of the pantomime; but Shakespeare was always concerned with stage effects; an artist not a teacher.

All the rest is admirable, the outcome of wide knowledge and

experience. There are very good pages on Corneille and Racine, as one would expect, for they are essential to the chosen theme; and Professor A. A. Parker has been drawn upon for some interesting information about the plays of Calderon. But the *clou* of the book is the lively and entertaining section on the Jesuit Theatre. Not only did the Fathers carry on the stage traditions of the Renaissance Courts, but abreast as always with the latest thing, they brilliantly developed opera and even ballet. At Vienna in the seventeenth century, these reached a point of magnificence, so much so that eventually the work of the Jesuits in this field actually received high commendation from Goethe. By that time the Jesuits had had a long experience of using the theatre as a means of grace, and despite the catastrophe that had been brought upon them the effect of their work survived.

In a final chapter the author touches on Ibsen's *Brand*, Shaw's remunerative travesty of St Joan of Arc, T. S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral*, works by Mauriac, Montherlant, Bernanos and Graham Greene, and makes special mention of Hochwaelder's moving play about the expulsion of the Jesuits from Paraguay.

J. J. D.

SHORT NOTICES

The Borderland: An Exploration of Theology in English Literature. By Roger Lloyd. Pp. 111. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 16s.)

IT IS with some hesitation that the author puts forward this revised and enlarged version of three lectures he gave to the University College of North Wales on the interplay between Christian Theology and English Literature. Nevertheless, it is an interesting attempt, and the fact that it is incomplete in one sense does not entirely detract from its merits. Indeed, a stimulus is given to the reader to reflect upon other similar instances in the writings of authors, who are not mentioned. The range here is fairly wide: Milton, Shakespeare, the author of *II Maccabees*, Aldous Huxley, Lytton Strachey, Charles Williams—and *Robinson Crusoe* and *Tom Brown's School-days* thrown in. But in English Literature, the list could go on almost for ever.

M. H.

De Sacramentis in Genere. By Clarentius McAuliffe, s.j. xv + 224 pp. (B. Herder. \$4.)

VERY many seminarists, Americans at least, find it difficult to read Latin, and they are without manuals written in a simple style.

Stating this, the author gives as his primary purpose the supplying of such a manual. The result is a book written in a style that would be an insult in any other language and, lest even the childish prose should be beyond the student, the English of some words is put in brackets after the Latin and a glossary of the more difficult words and expressions is provided at the end. The glossary includes such esoteric items as *conveniens*, *e contra*, *ne quidem*, *tollo*, *testamentum* and *vitirosus*. The uncharitable might suppose that the author had intended a *reductio ad absurdum* of the policy of teaching our present seminarists through Latin. If the style is jejune, so is the matter. Untouched by recent developments in sacramental theology, it achieves a certain pedagogical clarity, but of a kind more suitable to the teaching of geometry.

Sources of Christian Theology. II. Sacraments and Forgiveness: History and Doctrinal Development of Penance, Extreme Unction and Indulgences.
Edited with commentary by Paul F. Palmer, s.j. xxv + 410 pp.
(Darton, Longman & Todd. 50s.)

THE second instalment of Fr Palmer's most useful collection of documents in translation. It ranges from the New Testament to recent pronouncements of the Holy See and includes some important Protestant statements. This second volume is even more welcome than the first, since the material it gathers together is less readily available to the beginner. The commentary is again very full. Too full, some will think. A collection of documents with a minimum of historical and textual notes would have made an admirable tool. As it is, we have the distraction of a complete but disjointed history of the dogma with inadequate treatment of problems and differing opinions. Admittedly, the thirty pages of summary at the end gives a synthesis that offsets the disjointedness, but it remains inadequate for the range of documents produced. All the same, the book is indispensable to the student working in English. A continuous enumeration of the extracts would have made it much easier for the professor to refer to the work in lecture.

C. D.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

ing
ould
ose
t in
and
eric
us.
d a
ists
by
ain
g of

and
ces.
pp.

of
t to
ant
ome
dily
Too
n of
ool.
itory
ring
ives
uate
k is
ous
the

d for
x, in